

THE GLOW OF CHRIST

Glowing

Glowing

R. R. Knack

1938-1940 (6 - 10)

Frederick A. Norwood

THE GLOW OF CHRIST / CHURCH HISTORY

CHURCH HISTORY

Edited by J. H. NICHOLS and F. A. NORWOOD

with the cooperation of

ROLAND BAINTON (*Divinity School,
Yale University*)

R. PIERCE BEAVER (*Divinity School,
University of Chicago*)

ROBERT GRANT (*Divinity School,
University of Chicago*)

WINTHROP S. HUDSON (*Colgate-
Rochester Divinity School*)

SIDNEY E. MEAD (*Meadville Theo-
logical School*)

RAY C. PETRY (*Divinity School, Duke
University*)

MATTHEW SPINKA (*Hartford Theo-
logical Seminary, Emeritus*)

WILHELM PAUCK (*Union Theological
Seminary*)

JOHN DILLENBURGER (*Divinity School,
Drew University*)

EDWARD A. DOWNEY, JR. (*Princeton
Theological Seminary*)

VOL. XXVIII

DECEMBER, 1959

No. 4

TABLE OF CONTENTS

JULIAN AND JUSTINIAN AND THE UNITY OF FAITH AND CULTURE <i>Glanville Downey</i>	339
THE RELIGIOUS POLICIES OF DUKES WILHELM AND LUDWIG OF BAVARIA IN THE FIRST DECADE OF THE PROTESTANT ERA <i>Gerald Strauss</i>	350
SCHLEIERMACHER'S POLITICAL THOUGHT AND ACTIVITY, 1806-1813 <i>R. C. Raack</i>	374
METHODIST HISTORICAL STUDIES, 1930-1959 (Part I) <i>Frederick A. Norwood</i>	391
SURVEY: THE HISTORIOGRAPHY OF MORMONISM <i>Marvin S. Hill</i>	418

CONTENTS

COMMUNICATION	427
DOCTORAL DISSERTATIONS	432
THE HISTORY OF THE JESUITS' ESTATES, 1760-1888	Roy Clinton Dalton
THE LAST PHASE OF NESTORIAN HISTORY	John Joseph
"La Croix" AND THE "Ralllement"	Raymond Joseph Marion
BOOK REVIEWS	435
JEREMIAS, JOACHIM: <i>Die Kindertaufe in den vier ersten Jahrhunderten</i>	Robert M. Grant
ST. CYPRIAN: <i>The Lapsed, The Unity of the Catholic Church</i>	Richard Baepler
RICE, D. TALBOT: <i>The Beginnings of Christian Art</i>	Samuel Laeuchli
VAN DER MEER, F. and MOHRMANN, CHRISTINE: <i>Atlas of the Early Christian World</i>	John E. Rexine
BLAYNEY, IDA WALZ: <i>The Age of Luther</i>	John Dillenberger
MACLURE, MILLAR: <i>The Paul's Cross Sermons 1534-1642</i>	William Haller
WOLF, HANS HEINRICH: <i>Die Einheit des Bundes</i>	William Klassen
NOVARR, DAVID: <i>The Making of Walton's Lives</i>	Roy W. Battenhouse
YULE, GEORGE: <i>The Independents in the English Civil War</i>	J. F. Maclear
EUSDEN, JOHN DYKSTRA: <i>Puritans, Lawyers, and Politics in Early Seventeenth-Century England</i>	J. F. Maclear
HERR, RICHARD: <i>The Eighteenth Century Revolution in Spain</i>	Shelby T. McCloy
SMITH, B. A.: <i>Dean Church, The Anglican Response to Newman</i>	E. R. Hardy
DRURY, CLIFFORD MERRILL, ed.: <i>The Diaries and Letters of Henry H. Spalding and Asa Bowen Smith</i>	Thomas E. Jessett
ARRINGTON, L. J.: <i>The Great Basin Kingdom</i>	Marvin S. Hill
MILLER, ROBERT MOATS: <i>American Protestantism and Social Issues 1919-1939</i>	C. Howard Hopkins

JULIAN AND JUSTINIAN AND THE UNITY OF FAITH AND CULTURE*

GLANVILLE DOWNEY, *Dumbarton Oaks, Washington, D. C.*

The relationship—or lack of it—between religious belief and so-called secular culture is a topic which has been of perennial interest both to ancient students of religion and history and to modern historians. Students today use the phrase Unity of Faith and Culture because it has become current and because it bears some relationship to our own situation and problems, but we must also consider the subject, at least as we see it in antiquity, in terms of the interdependence or the interaction of faith and culture.

That the interdependence of religious belief and secular cultural activity in all its forms was something that was taken for granted in the Hellenised Roman world calls for no specific demonstration here. It is sufficient for the present purpose to refer to the recent summary of this subject by F. Temple Kingston in the *Anglican Theological Review*.¹ In the classical world religious faith might include both philosophy and cult, private and public, while culture involved the social order, and the political order, as well as literary and artistic activity. The individual, as a natural consequence of being a member of a state and a society built up by the Graeco-Roman achievement and tradition, could only be the heir of a system in which certain beliefs had come to be established and accepted—though not necessarily accepted to the same degree by each person—namely belief in the benevolent activity of the gods, or the divine power or powers, as protectors of the state and its members, along with confidence in the ability of the human intellect to work out metaphysical and philosophical problems, though there could be, of course, difference of opinion, and individual choice, in the matter of the solutions. Freedom and diversity in such matters were themselves an essential part of the heritage, and the possibility of choice did not obscure or call into question the fact that life was to be lived within a known framework in which the ordinary member of society, no matter which intellectual or religious path he elected to follow, still took his departure from a common inheritance and still was a member of a state in which, for the Romans, the public cult, representing the formal acknowledgement of the emperor as a figure with divine attributes, was a unifying and essential element.

*This study is a revised form of a paper read at the joint session of the American Historical Association and American Society of Church History in Washington, D.C., December 30, 1958. I am indebted to my colleague, Professor Milton V. Anastos, for his friendly comments which have contributed much to the improvement of the paper.

In the Eastern, Greek-speaking part of the Roman Empire, with which the present study is concerned, there was a special situation, in that the Greek tradition maintained itself in an unbroken line, in its original home and in its original language. When the relationships of Christianity and classical culture had to be worked out, the reactions of pagan thinkers to the new problem give us an instructive opportunity to see how the unity of faith and culture was understood at that time. This is a topic that has been studied by a number of scholars, such as Edwin Hatch, W. R. Halliday, Charles Norris Cochrane and Frederick C. Grant, to name only a few.² The eventual acceptance of what was considered the best part of the classical heritage was the beginning of a tradition of Christian scholarship which has lasted down to our own times. The present study will deal with two aspects of this development.

The first concerns the Emperor Julian the Philosopher. The success of Christianity in the fourth century evoked, as one might expect, quite different reactions from pagan leaders of different temperaments. Libanius ignored Christianity, Themistius tried to compete with it, and Julian set out to fight it. From the writings of Libanius, the great pagan teacher and orator of Antioch, one would hardly know that Christianity existed; at least, to him, it was not something that people such as himself and his peers had to take into account.³ His contemporary Themistius devoted himself to showing that Hellenism, as a way of life and a system of education, was at least as good as Christianity if not better. The ethical teachings of Christianity, he believed, could all be found in Hellenism, and the intelligent man ought to prefer the older and hence genuine system.⁴ Libanius and Themistius were private individuals, but Julian, as Emperor, was in a different position, and his remarkable temperament and personality led him to other measures.

The picture of Julian with which we have all grown up, the noble defender of the lost cause, is a touching and romantic spectacle. However, our picture of Julian has changed radically in the last half century, thanks to the researches of such scholars as Johannes Geffcken, Wilhelm Ensslin, Joseph Bidez, Roberto Andreotti, and Professor Dvornik,⁵ and our new knowledge both does greater justice to Julian, and throws a clearer light on the history of the Roman state and the real factors behind the success of Christianity in what Professor Dow⁶ has so aptly called the new-old fourth century.

We now understand that Julian's plan was not simply a campaign against Christianity as an inferior and erratic new kind of religion, but was a part of a larger political, social and economic program designed to save the state from what Julian and his supporters viewed as the gravest dangers. Here I believe Julian was thinking primarily in

terms of the unity or the interdependence of faith and culture, if we use the term culture in the widest sense.

The economic system which developed under Diocletian and Constantine the Great, at the end of the third century and the beginning of the fourth, was proving to bring hardships to the working classes, and Constantine's ambitious building program, coupled with increasing military expenses, inevitably produced an inflation which as always bore hardest on the poor and the middle classes. This is an aspect of the Constantinian system, as Julian and his friends would have viewed it, which has only recently been sufficiently understood, and in fact we must wait, for a full appreciation of it, until there is adequate publication of the coins issued by Julian, of which we do not yet possess a satisfactory catalogue. But the overall economic situation when Julian became emperor in 361—the inflation, the difficulties with the currency, and the characteristic local famine and price spiral at Antioch, Julian's headquarters—are all perfectly clear.⁷ Taken in conjunction with other aspects of his program which have been better known—the effort to reform justice, to strengthen the local municipal governments, to reduce the expenses of the imperial court—the economic problems are a first indication that Julian's program as a whole was not entirely a crusade against the Christian religion as such.

On the political side, we likewise have new knowledge. Here the basic problem, to Julian, was the danger to the state produced by the way in which Constantine and his sons had been slighting the old Roman gods in favor of the Christian deity. Every pagan knew that the Roman Empire and the Roman people had grown great through the favor of the old gods whose worship they had maintained with reverence and care, and it was obvious that if the imperial house adhered to Christianity, the traditional gods would be angered and would withdraw their favor. From Julian's point of view, the policy of Constantine and his dynasty had created a situation of the most alarming kind, which brought the gravest kind of threat to the stability and prosperity of the state.

In its political aspect, Julian's reaction was not merely a restoration of the status quo, but a radical return to older principles of Roman government, upon which the original greatness of the state had been based. It is only recently that Professor Dvornik has shown, in the course of his comprehensive study of the origins of Christian political philosophy, how Julian intended to abandon many of the features of the Roman imperial office as it had developed in his own time, returning instead to the political forms of the early Roman principate and the traditional Republican ceremonial. Julian refused the title of *Dominus* and condemned the formalized ruler cult and everything associated with

absolute and theocratic monarchy, and he set himself to obey and support the laws, instead of putting himself forward as Law Animate.⁸

In the matter of religion, likewise, Julian was not content to try simply to revive the pagan cults as they had existed before the time of Constantine, and to preserve pagan philosophy and literature in the forms they had then reached. Instead, Julian set out to found what has been called a "pagan church," with a professionally trained and disciplined priesthood organized in a hierarchy headed by a chief priest in each province. He likewise undertook to put together, himself, a new philosophical system, based on the principal traditional schools of philosophy, which would both preserve and vitalize the best features of classical philosophical thought. Julian was himself a keen and learned student of the history of religion and the history of philosophy, and was well qualified to undertake this task.

Modern scholars have pointed out that Julian's plan for a pagan church shows that he appreciated the importance, in the success of Christianity, of its professional clergy, trained and governed within a hierarchical structure, which made a notable contrast with the casual nature of the pagan priesthood. It is certainly true that by Julian's day the pagan cults had lost ground and tended to become unattractive and uninteresting, in comparison with the position they had once held. But we can also see, in this aspect of Julian's program, a part of a much more comprehensive effort to restore pagan thought and worship to the central place in human life they had formerly occupied. Classical philosophy, by Julian's time, had developed along so many different lines, and had become so academic and esoteric, that it had lost touch with ordinary life and could no longer be taken to represent the best elements of pagan thought. Julian's effort to organize a system of classical philosophy has been looked upon by some modern students as a bookish and impractical pastime, reflecting what has been thought of as the unworldly, rather dreamy side of his complex nature. It seems rather that Julian was here seeking to produce a strengthened synthesis of philosophical thought which would take its place alongside the new pagan church in a comprehensive revival of the classical way of life which, he thought, would be able to displace Christianity. Julian's program of reform, we have been coming to realize, reached into every department of life—government, justice, society, the economic order, cult and philosophy. In all these he tried to reintroduce the ancient virtues and to renew his people's connection with the ancient achievement, and it seems plain that he was convinced that all these departments of human thought and action must hang together. What counted most, to Julian and his friends, was that it was classical Greece that had first taken up the task of equipping man with all that fitted him for civil life and promoted his secular wellbeing.⁹

Julian's intense belief in the essential unity of faith and culture is illustrated by his famous edict on Christian teachers, in which he forbade Christians to teach classical literature, because, he pointed out, it could only be morally dishonest for a teacher to give instruction in material in which he himself did not sincerely believe.¹⁰ A man like Julian could only distrust any attempt at assimilation. Truth, to him, was established and single and it made a single culture and a single faith. In the belief in which Julian had been schooled, both classical civilization and the political ideal of the Roman Empire and its eternity were in themselves matters of faith, and Julian could not comprehend the new Christian idea of man, society and learning as another single and unified idea of faith.

Whether Julian's program as a whole was practical, and whether it could have been successful, is another question. Julian—and he was not alone in this—could not understand that there was something within Christianity which made it impossible to eliminate this new religion. It is, moreover, by no means certain that Christianity was responsible for all the evils which Julian found in the state; but Julian's attacking the Christian system on a comprehensive basis and attempting to replace it with a comprehensive classical system shows how important, to his mind, was the wholeness of faith and culture, whether the faith be pagan or Christian. For Julian, as for the classical Greek philosophers, ethics, as they concerned the individual, and politics, as they concerned the state, were not to be distinguished.¹¹

* * * * *

A little more than a century and a half later, when Justinian became emperor, paganism and Christianity had come to occupy quite different positions. Yet the problems that Justinian found were, in their implications, comparable to those Julian had faced. Justinian's ambitions, as we know, were two, the restoration of the political power of the ancient Roman Empire, and the definitive establishment of orthodox Christianity in the sense that orthodoxy was to be achieved within the Church, and heresy and paganism were to be once for all suppressed. To Justinian, heresy and paganism presented a threat to the welfare of the Roman State as a whole, just as Julian had believed that Christianity and its consequences had brought the Empire into mortal peril.

Like Julian, Justinian took a personal part in preparing the intellectual and spiritual foundations of the Christian state which he hoped to shape. As head of the state, responsible for both the spiritual and the political welfare of his subjects, he himself pursued theological studies which produced important results,¹²—studies which were the counterpart, *mutatis mutandis*, of Julian's philosophical and religious writings.

There is no need here to describe in detail Justinian's conception of the Christian state and of the Emperor's responsibility, as the head of it, for both the spiritual and the political welfare of his subjects. What I hope to do is to offer some new considerations on Justinian's views on Christianity and the Greek tradition which I think may help us to understand a little better certain aspects of his policy.

Justinian's deep respect for classical antiquity is well known.¹³ He saw that the Empire of his own day, as the direct heir of classical Greece and Rome, could draw renewed strength from a revival of those elements, political, legal and cultural, which had made the ancient Empire great. In view of the emperor's well known enthusiasm for antiquity, it has seemed a paradox that he should have closed, in 529, the ancient and celebrated schools of Athens, in which classical Greek philosophy was still being taught in establishments which were the direct descendants of the schools of Plato, Aristotle and their successors. This has seemed almost a blot on Justinian's character, but in reality his action was perfectly normal and consistent.

The real background of Justinian's action may be perceived in the academic activities of the major centers of learning in the Empire in his day. One of the most characteristic illustrations of the academic program of this period is found in the history of the School of Gaza in Palestine, one of the most famous and influential literary centers of that epoch. This School has not been well known among modern scholars because only a limited number of its productions have been preserved and these do not have a strong appeal to modern taste. Yet this School played a highly significant role in the literary history of the sixth century of our era. This peaceful little town on the coast of Palestine, admired for its attractive climate and its handsome buildings, was famous throughout the Empire for the special excellence of its teaching of the classical Greek language and literature. Gaza was of course not the only place in which the tradition of Hellenism was maintained; but by reason of its secluded location, the distinguished faculty which was built up, and its tranquil antiquarian atmosphere, this quiet university town carried on the Greek tradition in a manner which drew students from all over the Empire.

Gaza, however, was only one of several classical schools. A comparable center of learning, better known to scholars today, was Alexandria, where studies of Greek classical literature and philosophy had flourished since the Hellenistic period. Almost equally famous was Athens. Athens in fact might be thought to be somewhat similar to Gaza. This was a center of Greek literature and philosophy which was much older than Gaza and Alexandria, and as late as the fourth century

of our era the University of Athens, as we should now call it, was more famous than the school in Palestine, which began to reach its full development in the fifth century.¹⁴ To Athens some of the most famous Christian thinkers of the fourth century had gone, as young men, for their classical training. It would seem, on the face of it, at least puzzling that Justinian, the outspoken admirer of classical antiquity, should have closed the University of Athens two years after he became sole emperor. The teachers, and their instruction, were avowedly pagan, but even so the Emperor's action might appear to contradict his expressed admiration for what he himself spoke of in his legal writings as "the venerable authority of antiquity" and "faultless antiquity."¹⁵ Justinian encouraged the work of the historian Procopius of Caesarea and of the poet Paul the Silentary, both of whom wrote in classical Greek style, and the poems of the *Greek Anthology* attest the serious study of classical poetry in court circles in Constantinople.

The seeming inconsistency of Justinian's termination of the activities of the University of Athens¹⁶ can be explained quite naturally in the light of the development of the contemporary academic world. Very soon after he became sole emperor, Justinian issued edicts which forbade heretics, pagans and Samaritans to teach any subject whatever.¹⁷ He did this, of course, as a part of his campaign to achieve religious unity, for he realized clearly that proper education was basic to his purpose, and that—as he himself wrote¹⁸—pagan or heretical teachers might corrupt the minds of their students. The parallel with Julian's edict on teachers is very striking, and these edicts indicate¹⁹ that the closing of the University of Athens was a consequence of the teachers there being pagans.

Yet this does not alone explain what happened. It is at Gaza and Alexandria that we can see an even more important reason for the disappearance of pagan philosophical instruction at Athens. At both places there had developed the new type of Christian professor, a type which has lasted down to the present. In the School of Gaza, instruction was centered on the Greek classics, and the students devoted themselves to Homer and Thucydides and the other great pagan writers. But at the same time—and this is what is significant—the teachers were actively engaged in research and writing on Christian subjects. One of the best known figures is Procopius of Gaza whose career lay in the reign of Anastasius (A.D. 491-518).²⁰ In the classical style he wrote such pieces as a panegyric of the Emperor Anastasius, a monody on an earthquake at Antioch, a description in rhythmic prose of two pictures at Gaza which portrayed scenes from the story of Phaedra and Hippolytus, and a highly literary description of a mechanical clock at Gaza.²¹ Such writings are typical of the *belles-lettres* of the day. At the

same time, Procopius was well known as a theological writer. He composed a commentary on the Octateuch which the learned Patriarch Photius of Constantinople later described as somewhat fulsome because Procopius was careful to record all the opinions of all the authorities.²² He also wrote commentaries on Kings, Chronicles, Proverbs and the Song of Songs, and polemics which included an attack on Theodoret of Cyrrhus and a refutation of the Neoplatonist Proclus.

Further examples could be cited of similar scholarship in the Christian classical tradition at Gaza and elsewhere in Palestine at this period.²³ The school at Alexandria produced the same kind of scholarship, for example in the work of John Philoponus, who wrote on both Christian theology and Greek philosophy.²⁴ Careers such as those of Procopius of Gaza and John Philoponus will make much more intelligible the closing of the pagan schools at Athens. Obviously Christian truth could be taught only by teachers who were themselves Christians. It had long been recognized that there was a place in the education of the Christian for the best elements of classical literature, but it was plain that the classics could be taught properly only by teachers who were Christians and could present the classical tradition within the Christian framework. It could only be on these terms that Justinian could achieve the synthesis of the revived *Imperium Romanum* and the Church. As Professor Florovsky has recently put it, in a Christian society nothing can be simply secular.²⁵ In this sense the schools at Athens had become an anachronism and their closing was even overdue. These pagan schools had simply put themselves outside the academic program of the rest of the Empire. It was not the teaching of classical philosophy at Athens that Justinian found dangerous, but the fact that it was being taught by pagans who had no interest in helping build up the kind of Christian culture that Justinian saw was needed as an essential basis for the Christian State. As we know, the Athenian professors found themselves unable to become Christians to save their jobs, and went as refugees to the court of the King of Persia.

Julian and Justinian, each in his own way, saw, as Professor Tsirintanes of Athens has recently emphasized, that the past is a condition for the existence of a civilization, and that belief in a civilization is belief in the historical cohesion of values.²⁶ The sense of the "presentness of the past," as Justinian and others of his day conceived it, proved of course to be one of the vital bases of Byzantine civilization and of the role of the Orthodox Church in the Byzantine Empire.²⁷ When we recall that Julian, from his own point of view, had had the same sense of the continuity of the present with its roots, we realize what it was that the unity of faith and culture meant to both rulers. Both these learned and conscientious emperors were sure that unity

existed and that it could be realized in practice; and as Roman sovereigns they conceived it to be their duty to use all the power of the state to put this unity into effect. The contrasts and at the same time the similarities that we have seen in these two epochs are a commentary on the ancient view of the necessity and the naturalness of the unity of faith and culture.

1. F. Temple Kingston, "Classical Culture and the Wholeness of Faith," *Anglican Theological Review*, XL (1958), pp. 26-36.
2. Edwin Hatch, *The Influence of Greek Ideas and Usages upon the Christian Church* (Hibbert Lectures, 1888; London, 1890), reprinted in 1957 in the Harper Torchbook series under the title *The Influence of Greek Ideas on Christianity*, with valuable foreword, notes and bibliography by Frederick C. Grant; W. R. Halliday, *The Pagan Background of Early Christianity* (Liverpool and London, 1925); C. N. Cochrane, *Christianity and Classical Culture* (Oxford, 1940), reprinted 1944, and reissued in 1957 by the Oxford University Press, New York, in the Galaxy series.
3. On Libanius' attitude toward Christianity, see J. Misson, "Libanius et le christianisme," *Musée belge*, XXIV (1920), pp. 72-89; P. Petit, *Libanius et la vie municipale à Antioche au IV^e siècle après J.-C.* (Paris, 1955), p. 196.
4. See the studies by the present writer, "Education and Public Problems as Seen by Themistius," *Transactions of the American Philological Association*, LXXXVI (1955), pp. 291-307, and "Themistius and the Defense of Hellenism in the Fourth Century" (one of the Bedell Lectures for 1956), *Harvard Theological Review*, L (1957), pp. 259-274.
5. J. Geffeken, *Kaiser Julianus* (Leipzig 1914); W. Ensslin, "Kaiser Julians Gesetzgebungswork und Reichsverwaltung," *Klio*, XVIII (1923), pp. 104-19; J. Bidez, *La vie de l'empereur Julien* (Paris, 1930), translated into German, with additional material, under the title (in which the change of the description of Julian may be noted) *Julian der Abtrünnige* (Munich, 1940); R. Andreotti, "L'opera legislativa ed amministrativa dell'Imperatore Giuliano," *Nuova Rivista Storica*, XIV (1930), pp. 342-383, together with the same scholar's *Il Regno dell'Imperatore Giuliano* (Bologna, 1936). Professor Dvornik's study is cited below, note 8.
6. In a forthcoming paper in *Harvard Studies in Classical Philology*.
7. On the economic situation in Julian's time see S. Mazzarino, *Aspetti sociali del quarto secolo* (Rome, 1951). On Julian's sojourn at Antioch see the studies by the present writer, "Julian the Apostate at Antioch," *Church History*, VIII (1939), pp. 303-315, and "The Economic Crisis at Antioch under Julian the Apostate," *Studies in Roman Economic and Social History in Honor of A. C. Johnson* (Princeton, 1951), pp. 312-321.
8. F. Dvornik, "The Emperor Julian's 'Reactionary' Ideas on Kingship," *Late Classical and Mediaeval Studies in Honor of A. M. Friend, Jr.* (Princeton, 1955), pp. 71-81, especially pp. 75-76.
9. See S. H. Butcher, *Some Aspects of the Greek Genius* (ed. 2, London, 1893), pp. 4-42.
10. This edict is so important, and so characteristic of Julian's views, that it is quoted here in full, in the translation by Mrs. W. C. Wright in her edition of Julian's works in the Loeb Classical Library, II, pp. 117-123 (*Epistle* 36 = *Epistle* 61 in the edition of J. Bidez and F. Cumont): "I hold that a proper education results, not in laboriously acquired symmetry of phrases and language, but in a healthy condition of mind, I mean a mind that has understanding and true opinions about things good and evil, honorable and base. Therefore, when a man thinks one thing and teaches his pupils another, in my opinion he fails to educate exactly in proportion as he fails to be an honest man. And if the divergence between a man's convictions and his utterances is merely in trivial matters, that can be tolerated somehow, though it is wrong. But if in matters of the greatest importance a man has certain opinions and teaches the contrary, what is that but the conduct of hucksters, and not honest but thoroughly dissolute men in that they praise most highly the things they believe to be most worthless, thus cheating and enticing by their phrases those to whom they desire to transfer their worthless wares. Now all who profess to teach anything whatever ought to be men of upright character,

and ought not to harbor in their souls opinions irreconcilable with what they publicly profess; and, above all, I believe it is necessary that those who associate with the young and teach them rhetoric should be of that upright character; for they expound the writings of the ancients, whether they be rhetoricians or grammarians, and still more if they are sophists. For these claim to teach, in addition to other things, not only the use of words, but morals also, and they assert that political philosophy is their peculiar field. Let us leave aside, for the moment, the question whether this is true or not. But while I applaud them for aspiring to such high pretensions, I should applaud them still more if they did not utter falsehoods and convict themselves of thinking one thing and teaching their pupils another. What! Was it not the gods who revealed all their learning to Homer, Hesiod, Demosthenes, Herodotus, Thucydides, Isocrates and Lysias? Did not these men think that they were consecrated, some to Hermes, others to the Muses? I think it is absurd that men who expound the works of these writers should dishonor the gods whom they used to honor. Yet, though I think this absurd, I do not say that they ought to change their opinions and then instruct the young. But I give them this choice; either not to teach what they do not think admirable, or, if they wish to teach, let them first really persuade their pupils that neither Homer nor Hesiod nor any of these writers whom they expound and have declared to be guilty of impiety, folly and error in regard to the gods, is such as they declare. For since they make a livelihood and receive pay from the works of those writers, they thereby confess that they are most shamefully greedy of gain, and that, for the sake of a few drachmae, they would put up with anything. It is true that, until now, there were many excuses for not attending the temples, and the terror that threatened on all sides [i.e. under the Christian régime] absolved men for concealing the truest beliefs about the gods. But since the gods have granted us liberty, it seems to me absurd that men should teach what they do not believe to be sound. But if they believe that those whose interpreters they are and for whom they sit, so to speak, in the seat of the prophets, were wise men, let them be the first to emulate their piety towards the gods. If, however, they think that those writers were in error with respect to the most honored gods, then let them betake themselves to the churches of the Galileans to expound Matthew and Luke,

since you Galileans are obeying them when you ordain that men shall refrain from temple-worship. For my part, I wish that your ears and your tongues might be 'born anew,' as you would say, as regards these things in which may I ever have part, and all who think and act as is pleasing to me. For religious and secular teachers let there be a general ordinance to this effect: Any youth who wishes to attend the schools is not excluded; nor indeed would it be reasonable to shut out from the best way boys who are still too ignorant to know which way to turn, and to overawe them into being led against their will to the beliefs of their ancestors. Though indeed it might be proper to cure these, even against their will, as one cures the insane, except that we concede indulgence to all for this sort of disease. For we ought, I think, to teach, but not punish, the demented." On this edict and its significance, see the present writer's article, "The Emperor Julian and the Schools," *Classical Journal*, LIII (1957), pp. 97-103.

11. See p. xi of the Foreword by Kenneth M. Setton in Henry Osborne Taylor, *The Emergence of Christian Culture in the West* (New York, Harper Torchbooks, 1958; originally published in 1901 under the title *The Classical Heritage of the Middle Ages*).
12. See the study of M. V. Anastos, "The Immutability of Christ and Justinian's Condemnation of Theodore of Mopsuestia," *Dumbarton Oaks Papers*, VI (1951), pp. 123-160. Professor Anastos is preparing a monograph on the intellectual history of the reign of Justinian.
13. The paragraphs which follow have grown in part out of previous studies by the present writer, "Justinian as Achilles," *Transactions of the American Philological Association*, LXXI (1940), pp. 68-77; "Justinian's View of Christianity and the Greek Classics," *Anglican Theological Review*, XL (1958), pp. 13-22; "The Christian Schools of Palestine: A Chapter in Literary History," *Harvard Library Bulletin*, XII (1958), pp. 297-319.
14. The best account of the work of the schools at Athens at this period is J. W. H. Walden, *The Universities of Ancient Greece* (New York, 1909).
15. *veneranda vetustatis auctoritas* (Nov. 23, 3, p. 188, line 9 ed. Schoell-Kroll, *Corpus iuris civilis*); *inculpabilis antiquitas* (Nov. 8, *iuriurandum*, *ibid.* p. 89, line 36).
16. Justinian's action is thought paradoxical by Ernst Stein, *Histoire du Bas-Empire*, II (Paris, 1949), p. 276, cf. p. 372. J. B. Bury comes closer to a correct understanding of the mea-

- sure, though he does not take into account all the factors involved: *History of the Later Roman Empire* (London, 1923; reprinted, New York, Dover Publications, 1958), II, pp. 369-370.
17. *Cod. Just.* 1.5.18.4; 1.11.10.2.
 18. *Cod. Just.* 1.5.18.4. It is interesting to compare St. Augustine's statement (*De doctrina Christiana*, IV, 27 [59]): "The man whose life is in harmony with his teaching will teach with greater effect . . . Whatever may be the majesty of the style, the life of the speaker will count for more in securing the hearer's compliance."
 19. As Bury (*loc. cit.*, above, note 15) suggested.
 20. On his career, see K. Seitz, *Die Schule von Gaza* (Diss., Heidelberg, 1892), pp. 9-21, and W. von Christ, *Geschichte der griechischen Litteratur*, ed. by W. Schmid and O. Stählin, ed. 6, II, pt. 2 (Munich, 1924), pp. 1029-1031.
 21. H. Diebels, "Ueber die von Prokop beschriebene Kunstuhr von Gaza: mit einem Anhang enthaltend Text und Uebersetzung der Ekphrasis Horologion des Prokopios von Gaza," *Abhandlungen der k. Preussischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, Philosophisch-historische Klasse*, 1917, No. 7.
 22. Photius, *Bibliotheca*, cod. 206 (Migne, P.G., CIII, cols. 676-677).
 23. See the present writer's article in the *Harvard Library Bulletin*, cited above, note 13.
 24. On John Philoponus, see H. D. Safrey, "Le chrétien Jean Philopon et la survivance de l'école d'Alexandrie au VI^e siècle," *Revue des études grecques*, LXVII (1954), pp. 396-410 (for this reference I am indebted to Professor Sirarpie der Nersessian). For other studies of the work of the school of Alexandria at this period, see M. V. Anastas, "The Alexandrian Origin of the Christian Topography of Cosmas Indicopleustes," *Dumbarton Oaks Papers*, III (1946), pp. 73-80; *idem*, "Aristotle and Cosmas Indicopleustes on the Void," *Prosphora eis Stilpona P. Kyriakiden* (Thessalonica, 1953), pp. 35-50 (*Hellenika, Parartema IV*).
 25. G. Florovsky, "Empire and Desert: Antinomies of Christian History," *Greek Orthodox Theological Review*, III (1957), p. 143. The reader should note what Professor Florovsky says (*ibid.*, pp. 141-142) on Justinian's conception of the Christian State.
 26. A. N. Tsirantanes, *Towards a Christian Civilization: A Draft Issued by the Christian Union of Professional Men of Greece* (Athens, "Damascus" Publications, 1950), pp. 156-157.
 27. See the present writer's article "The Byzantine Church and the Presentness of the Past," *Theology Today*, XV (1958), pp. 84-99, also the review article "Byzantium and the Classical Tradition," *The Phoenix*, XII (1958), pp. 125-129.

1960 Brewer Prize Contest

The American Society of Church History announces that its next Brewer Prize competition for a book-length manuscript in church history will conclude in 1960. The award will be announced at the annual meeting of the Society in December of that year. It will consist of a subsidy of one thousand dollars to assist the author in the publication of the winning manuscript, which shall be described on its title-page as the "Frank S. and Elizabeth D. Brewer Prize Essay of the American Society of Church History" and shall be published in a manner acceptable to the Society. If competing essays are otherwise of equal quality, preference will be given to those dealing with topics related to the history of Congregationalism. Complete manuscripts in final form, fully annotated, must be in the hands of the Secretary, Professor Winthrop S. Hudson, 1100 South Goodman St., Rochester 20, New York, by September 15, 1960. There must be two copies, a typescript and a first carbon, on standard weight paper, double-spaced, with a left-hand margin of at least an inch and one-half.

THE RELIGIOUS POLICIES OF DUKES WILHELM AND LUDWIG OF BAVARIA IN THE FIRST DECADE OF THE PROTESTANT ERA*

GERALD STRAUSS, *Indiana University*

On the seventh of October, 1528, late at night, agents of Dukes Wilhelm IV and Ludwig X of Bavaria came to the home in Abensberg of Johann Aventinus, the distinguished historian and pedagogue, and arrested him, "ob evangelium," as he notes the occasion in his diary.¹ The Dukes' action was not unexpected. Aventinus recorded arrests of acquaintances and associates in May and July, also "ob evangelium." He had been away from home much of the time, possibly to avoid the same fate. He spent the summer in Regensburg² where the Bavarian government had no jurisdiction, but where prolonged residence, at a time when both Lutheranism and Anabaptism seemed to be making rapid gains there,³ could not but arouse suspicion in Munich. In early October Aventinus returned to Abensberg, his captors at his heels.

The charge against him listed several instances of non-compliance with ducal decrees concerning religious conduct—close association with known or suspected heretics, carelessness in observing fast-day rules, participating in discussions of forbidden topics—but overt action was hardly needed to arouse ill will against him. Aventinus was one of the most outspoken men of that blunt age in which he lived. Although none of his major historical works had as yet been put into print, his strong critical views and savory phrases circulated widely,⁴ and they stung where intended. Resentment and alarm over his attacks on the clergy and his apparent espousal of the Lutheran heresy were intense in the Bavarian hierarchy,⁵ and there must have been strong pressure on the Dukes, particularly after 1526, when he produced the most unrestrained of his anti-clerical writings,⁶ to proceed against him. This, however, could not have been an easy decision for Wilhelm and Ludwig. Aventinus was among the most illustrious of the community of German humanists whose members the Dukes could ill afford to alienate. He was a renowned Bavarian patriot. He was closely tied to the ducal family: official historiographer since 1517, and before that tutor to Ludwig, now co-sovereign with Wilhelm, and to his younger brother Ernst, now Administrator of the bishopric of Passau. His relations with his princes had been excellent, and expressions of high gratitude had not been lacking. Only the weightiest of considerations could have persuaded the Dukes to order his arrest.

What were these considerations? What was the chain of events

*Much of the material on which this study is based was gathered during a research trip financed by a grant from the Research Committee of the University of Alabama.

which led to the incarceration of a man whose work added so much luster to the reign of the young Dukes? Only a detailed investigation of the religious policies of Wilhelm and Ludwig in the first decade of the Protestant era can answer these questions. As always, however, when one holds the magnifying glass to processes of statecraft, the individual strands of policies and implementing actions merge into a tissue which tends to cover, rather than expose, underlying principles. The Bavarian policy makers were not committed to any fixed purposes. As we watch them at work, we catch a glimpse of a government first reaching out for an understanding of the new teachings, perceiving their relations to the political realities that must determine policies, finally girding itself for action against what assumed, more and more as time went on, the appearance of a dangerous foe.

Aventinus' confinement, incidentally, was of short duration. He had supporters in high places. On the eighteenth of October Leonhard von Eck, the powerful ducal Chancellor, secured his release.⁷ He stayed out of religious controversy after that and was not molested again.

I

In 1517 Bavaria had just emerged from a troubrous period of political and dynastic dissension. Thirteen years earlier Upper and Lower Bavaria had become reunited under the Dukes at Munich, after the death of Georg of the Landshut line and the defeat of his son-in-law Rupprecht of the Palatinate in a brief but violent war of succession. The victor, Albrecht IV, a skillful and rational ruler, capped the success of his arms with a political triumph, the institution of primogeniture in his Duchy.⁸ Thus the new century had opened auspiciously; but the primogeniture decree failed its very first test. Albrecht died prematurely in 1508, leaving three minor sons, Wilhelm, Ludwig, and Ernst. For three years there was a regency, provided for in Albrecht's will and exercised by his brother Wolfgang and, fully equal with him, six representatives of the Bavarian Estates. In 1511 Wilhelm, turned eighteen, took the reins himself. Soon after that his brother Ludwig reasoned that the decree could not apply to him since he had been born before its promulgation, and demanded co-rule or a third of the Duchy. Ludwig had timed his challenge well. Since 1508 the Estates had been urging a clarification and augmentation of their traditional liberties.⁹ Now came demands for greater participation in the administration of the Duchy. Wilhelm had to retreat on all fronts. At a dramatic session in 1514 of the Estates, the two young Dukes (Ernst was still in Aventinus' care and preparing for a study journey to Italy), and their advisers, a general reconciliation took place: Wilhelm and Ludwig to rule jointly but with separate administrations,

the Estates to maintain a standing committee for close cooperation with the Dukes.¹⁰ Still unsolved was the question of what independent income might be found for the youngest brother, now approaching majority. A career in the Church seemed inescapable for him. The financial condition of Bavaria was far from sound after a century of division and intermittent warfare. There was further cause for grave anxiety in the expansionist moves of the Habsburgs whose lands surrounded Bavaria on three sides. Wilhelm's and Ludwig's official relationship with the great figures of their time, Emperor and Pope above all, was therefore determined by a multiplicity of concerns vital to the status of their ancient territory.

These concerns rested in the capable hands of the ducal Chancellor, Leonhard von Eck, one of the great Realpolitiker of his time. This career politician, whose astuteness had so impressed the representatives of the Bavarian Estates that they demanded—unsuccessfully—his permanent dismissal,¹¹ saw in the precarious situation of Bavaria a supreme challenge to his talents. The principle of his policies was simple enough: might and prestige of the Dukes was to be increased; they must be masters in their own house, they must fill a position of influence in the Empire. It was the virtuosity of his means which won him his reputation, favorable or abhorrent, depending on the critic's allegiance. In 1520 there arose an opportunity to display the flexibility of statesmanship for which he became famous. Wilhelm's victory of the previous year over his irascible brother-in-law, Ulrich of Württemberg,¹² had been turned to frustration by Habsburg diplomacy. In February 1520 the Duchy of Württemberg came into the control of Charles V. Eck at once recognized the futility of Wilhelm's inclination to sulk. Some months previously he had recommended a wait-and-see attitude toward the new Emperor. Since Charles had so far shown himself well disposed, he counselled, close attachment to him was indicated. If, on the other hand, it should turn out that greater advantages were to be gained by joining Charles' opponents, then no scruples must stand in the way of such a move.¹³ In 1520 Charles had got the upper hand; he could not now be resisted. Eck therefore urged both Dukes to attend the diet called to meet at Worms, and to attend with great show, in order to fix attention on their position among the German princes, and to use their presence to enhance their influence.¹⁴

If at this time either the Dukes or their Chancellor were troubled over the movement that had begun to spread from Wittenberg, they feared its implicit threat to established law and order. Eck was quick to detect the social and political implications of the new teachings. To him the momentous transformation which the astrologers had been

announcing for the year 1524, a prognosis which he took very seriously, could be but one thing: a fusion of the religious revolt with the social groundswell whose tremors his fine senses detected. He prepared a memorandum for the Dukes accordingly, warning them, in January 1520, that the great conflagration which was leaping up everywhere could not burn itself out without grievous damage.¹⁵ Later he was to refer to the unduly long period of tolerance which the new teachings enjoyed in Bavaria.¹⁶ As a matter of fact, the first reactions of the Dukes had been at least non-committal, if not benevolent. They were aware of the various failings of the church organization in their lands, and they knew how these enfeebled the entire state. They had themselves refused to permit the sale of the indulgence of 1517.¹⁷ It was known to them that Luther's theses were being passed about in their territory,¹⁸ but they were not disposed to take immediate action. When the Ingolstadt professor Johann Eck returned from Rome with the Bull *Exsurge Domine*, Wilhelm reminded the bishops in his lands that the Emperor had granted Luther a safe conduct to Worms, there to hear him. Until the Emperor's decision was announced the parish clergy should not use the pulpit to condemn the man and his writings.¹⁹ Developments were to be awaited.

Wilhelm and Ludwig arrived in Worms at the end of January, in splendid style, as Leonhard von Eck had recommended.²⁰ Wilhelm had some conferences with the Emperor and apparently succeeded in impressing Charles favorably, for which he received a pat on the back from his Chancellor. ("I am well aware of Your Princely Grace's competence," Eck wrote him, "when Your Princely Grace has decided to buckle down and not loaf."²¹) Late in February he left to proceed to Augsburg in the affairs of the Swabian League. Ludwig remained in attendance at the diet to await the appearance of Luther. Letters which Wilhelm wrote to Leonhard von Eck while at Worms show that he did not abandon his moderate position toward Luther. He maintained that his writings should not be burned.²² The Venetian ambassador Gasparo Contarini, who saw him in Augsburg on April 9, reported a conversation in which Wilhelm averred that all Germany would rally to Luther if he restricted himself to criticism of religious abuses.²³ Ludwig's reports from Worms describe Luther's appearance before the Emperor in objective words with no opinions recorded.²⁴ There is no reason to think that the deliberations at Worms, or the events leading to Worms, touched the religious convictions of the Dukes with either doubt or decision. But they were not likely to forget Eck's warnings that however justified Luther's protest, its consequences could not be foreseen and were bound to be troublesome.

II

Considerations of high politics were not the only ones which dictated a close alliance with Charles in 1521. An issue in which the support of the Emperor would prove invaluable was the candidacy of Duke Ernst for the coadjutorship of the bishopric of Eichstädt. Finding an adequate source of income for this youngest of the three Dukes was a vital domestic matter. Wilhelm and Ludwig had first occupied themselves with it in 1513, shortly after their reconciliation, when Ernst had just turned fourteen. The brothers were naturally fearful lest Ernst raise demands for co-rule similar to Ludwig's. The Duchy could not afford a third court. Even payments on existing debts could not be met without new loans and mortgages.²⁵ For Ernst there seemed to exist no alternative to a career in the Church, but to find prebends which would support him in the proper manner did not prove easy. At the Imperial diet held at Worms in 1513, Ludwig went before the Emperor Maximilian and implored him in the most urgent terms to help procure the coadjutorship of Salzburg or at least that of Passau for the young Duke, who even now, he said, displayed great aptitude for the clerical life.²⁶ Ludwig made as strong a plea as he could. He stressed the heavy debt faced by the older brothers, the eagerness of the chapters at Salzburg and Passau to have Ernst, the many bonds uniting the Houses of Austria and Bavaria, and the Emperor's influence with the Pope who would surely issue the appropriate orders. A petition from the Dukes' mother, Maximilian's sister, was added. The matter was kept before the Emperor through letters and emissaries.

Salzburg proved unobtainable at the time, but in 1517 Ernst got to be Administrator at Passau. It was not long, however, before the able and ambitious prince showed open disdain for the life which his brothers had marked out for him.²⁷ Only fat revenues would keep him in the Church, and the debt-ridden bishopric of Passau did not provide them. When, therefore, an opportunity to obtain the coadjutorship of Eichstädt arose in 1521, Wilhelm and Ludwig once again made their plea. Neither the Dukes nor their Chancellor were blind to the great strategic value of this piece of territory north of the Danube. "A good fortress wall," Eck called it.²⁸ This, of course, complicated the problem of procurement which was already grave because of the rules concerning pluralities, and because Ernst had not taken Holy Orders.²⁹ Furthermore, the Dukes still had their minds set on Salzburg for Ernst. Not until 1540 were they able to win that prize for him, and not without protracted and difficult negotiations,³⁰ but Ernst's distinguished subsequent career at Salzburg, though not noted for its spiritual character, never gave them cause for regrets.

It is clear from all this that whatever personal impressions the Dukes may have carried to and from Worms, a policy in accordance with the decisions made there was mandatory for them. Still they hesitated to take decisive action against the heresy at home, perhaps because the outcome of certain important negotiations which were being conducted at Rome late in 1521 was awaited. In February 1522 a group of professors from the University of Ingolstadt, led by Dr. Johann Eck, Luther's famous opponent, petitioned the Dukes for a special decree to enforce the Edict of Worms in Bavaria.³¹ The Chancellor supported the request. He urged the promulgation of such a mandate on the Dukes and he urged it on the other members of the Swabian League which was then meeting in Ulm. He also supplied rough drafts of the decree to be issued. The Dukes now complied and, in early March, sent two draft versions of the decree to Munich where the Councillors were to make the choice between the shorter and the longer. A second letter from Ulm, a few days later, emphasized the need for haste. The mandate was to be released at once and dated back to March 5.³²

The Councillors deliberated and decided to publish the briefer of the two drafts, the other containing too much theological argumentation with Lutheran beliefs to be effective. The shorter version assumed the theological issues to have been settled by papal condemnation, restricted itself to a brief history of the heresy, and announced steps to be taken toward its extirpation.

As is surely known to all [the Edict begins], Martin Luther has published certain writings which have been declared by Pope Leo and his learned advisers to be suspect, obnoxious to Christian teaching, and heretical. Such warnings not having proved sufficient to cause Luther to desist, the Emperor recently ordered him to appear before him at the Imperial Diet at Worms. There the Emperor graciously and with fatherly concern reminded, besought, and begged him to consider well the consequences of a possible split in the Christian Church. But Luther was not to be turned from his stubborn path. The Emperor and Estates therefore caused an Edict to be published against him, his supporters and comforters, and all their books and writings. This Edict has been posted in all Our cities. Now, whereas it appears to Us that Luther is not merely guilty of insubordination, but that his shocking teachings will result in nothing more certain than a tearing asunder of all divine and human laws, customs, and regulations, which, as loyal servants of Pope and Emperor, We may not condone, We therefore order all Our subjects to reject each and all those articles of the Lutheran creed which have been or will be condemned, and not to engage in disputations over any such article. We further instruct all Our officials to be vigilant in their respective districts, and to take into custody every person, of whatever estate he may be, who is suspected of association with the Lutheran heresy. He is to be held until We ourselves, having been apprised, can make disposition of the case. This Decree is being printed and posted throughout Our lands, so that no one may claim ignorance of Our wishes and commands.

The Edict did, in fact, reach every town and hamlet in Bavaria,³³

but its immediate effects were slight. In mid-March the *Pfleger*³⁴ in Ingolstadt reported a priest named Bardian for having participated in a discussion on Communion under both forms. Wilhelm ordered an investigation. The man's action was judged to constitute Lutheranism and he was asked to explain and recant. This he did, promising henceforth to observe the Edict, and that was the end of the matter.³⁵ Only one other case of arrest is known.³⁶ Such lack of action certainly does not mean that the new teachings had, in 1522, made no progress in Bavaria. But the Dukes apparently could not bring themselves to a systematic exposure of the heresy. Leonhard von Eck knew that severe measures would have to be employed if the Edict were really to be implemented, but for the moment he counselled moderation until its deterrent effect could be observed.³⁷ The wording of the Edict itself precluded general persecution by obliging local officials to make immediate report to the Dukes of every action taken. The power of ducal agents did not go beyond temporary arrest and notification.

Obviously Wilhelm and Ludwig were still marking time. Their deeds as well as their omissions still lacked conviction. They had aligned themselves with Pope and Emperor, but they retained full freedom of action. Events elsewhere, however, now intervened to make more determined steps advisable.

III

The religious crisis of the early sixteenth century presented the Dukes with a unique opportunity to affirm their sovereign rights over the regular and secular clergy in their lands by assuming the sponsorship of ecclesiastical reform in the Bavarian Church. In pursuing this policy the Dukes and their advisers could claim the support of tradition. Bavarian rulers had often taken an active role in the supervision of clerical propriety. Conditions which invited the reformed existed in Bavaria as elsewhere; visitation records³⁸ reveal a wide range of abuses: the sale of monastic property, simony and commercialism, pawning Church treasures to Jews, offering manuscripts to collectors. Serious breaches of discipline seemed to be general. Concubinage was a universal practice, but we also hear of the abandonment of other vows, of disobedience and insubordination, coarse behavior and even murder within monastery walls.³⁹ In order to arrest the spread of this decay there arose in the various orders reforming sects like the Community of Observants and the Martinians among the Franciscans, and the Kastl and Melk movements among the Benedictines.

The Bavarian Dukes not only encouraged this restoration, they often took matters into their own hands. Albrecht III personally visited monastic houses and chapters in order to observe conditions and learn

to correct them where necessary.⁴⁰ The same ruler sought to join the various observances into a common reform front.⁴¹ Ludwig the Rich ordered the Franciscan houses in Landshut and Ingolstadt occupied by Observants. Albrecht IV, Wilhelm's father, acting against the determined opposition of the bishops, even appointed a commission of prelates and jurists to visit and improve the monasteries in his lands.⁴²

An increase in ducal prestige and power was a not unwelcome by-product of these early attempts at centralized reform. In the early 1520's the need for reform was more obvious than ever, and the Bavarian rulers were in a better position than their forebears to relate it to their political plans. But this was a far-reaching ambition, and it required delicate negotiations at Rome.

That such negotiations were in fact taking place with agents of Pope Leo X is attested by the existence of the draft of a papal bull, dated November 14, 1521, which was to extend to the Bavarian Dukes the right of visitation in their territories.⁴³ But Leo died in December 1521, and the project came to nothing. The passing of the great Medici pontiff, however, gave to the whole issue of reform a new aspect. Early in January 1522, the deadlocked Cardinals chose Adrian of Utrecht, former tutor of the Emperor Charles and, at the time of his election, Bishop of Tortosa and Viceroy of Spain. Adrian was the first non-Italian pope in a century and a half. Widespread surprise and dismay greeted the announcement; the Emperor's pleasure, on the other hand, was apparent. Adrian, who took the name of Adrian VI, was known for his deep piety, for the simplicity of his tastes, for his dislike of show and flattery. Italy resigned itself to the worst from this German. A reform papacy was in the offing.

Adrian entered Rome in August, and the expected changes were not slow in coming. Adrian's grand design, the reunion of western Christendom for more effective opposition to the Turks, required a thorough housecleaning, which was to commence in Rome and to proceed to all the limbs of the Church. Such rulers as had something to gain from the papacy were therefore forced into a speedy reappraisal of their religious policies. In Bavaria, too, the new regime in Rome was reflected in certain decisions that were now taken. Not only the coveted rights of visitation and correction, but the future of Duke Ernst, who was still sulking at Passau, depended on the good will of the new pope. When, therefore, Dr. Johann Eck made ready to go to Rome to attend Adrian's coronation, Wilhelm commissioned him to be his representative at the Throne of St. Peter's.

In Johann Eck the Dukes had an invaluable asset in their relations with the earnest Adrian. A learned and articulate man, theologian and jurist, well thought of in academic circles, even among the practitioners

of the humanist disciplines, faithful and conscientious in all his duties,⁴⁴ passionately attached to his religion, Johann Eck became the symbol of the quick but constructive resistance to the spreading heresy which he advocated. His labors on behalf of the bull against Luther and the Leipzig disputations had gained him a wide renown whose reflection Wilhelm and Ludwig were now eager to catch. Eck, however, did not reach Rome at this time. The plague had broken out afresh there in September, and he was forced to return. In December a letter from Adrian reached him. The Pope expressed his regrets over the mischance which had prevented their meeting, spoke warmly of Eck's work, and implored him to use all his skill and all his strength with his territorial lords to persuade them to favor determined action against the Lutherans at the Nuremberg diet which was then in progress.⁴⁵

To that same end Adrian had ordered his Nuntius in Germany, Francesco Chieregato, to Nuremberg. Ludwig had a talk with Chieregato there, and the Bishop was diplomatic enough to speak in kind words of the measures already taken in Bavaria to exclude the heresy.⁴⁶ Ludwig, in his report of the conversation to his brother, points out that this good will must be at once exploited. Powers of visitation, of investiture of abbots and their removal without the consent of the bishops —these may be gained now if their cards are played right. Adrian himself turned to the Dukes early in 1523 with a request for cooperation.⁴⁷ But the outcome of the Nuremberg meetings was a sharp disappointment to the Pope. Adrian's sincere confessions of grave irregularities in the Church organization and his plea for time to correct them, which Chieregato had read to the diet with unprecedented candor, had been heard, but had not produced the desired result.⁴⁸ The Edict of Worms was not ordered enforced. The assembled Princes and Estates could not be moved to anything more than some tentative decisions respecting preachers and printers.⁴⁹ In Bavaria, however, now for the first time there appeared some evidence of a serious determination to carry out the terms of the imperial and ducal edicts.

The first indication of the changed spirit was a new ducal order, dated February 25, 1523, and despatched to all administrative officials:

Once again we inform you that it is Our earnest command, decision, and wish that, under threat of serious penalty and Our high displeasure, you are to be relentlessly watchful and make active inquiry concerning those infected with the Lutheran heresy.⁵⁰

Upon this order followed letters of admonition to responsible local officers where incidence of the heresy had been reported. The *Pfleger* and Council of Aichach were told to arrest certain citizens who had been openly goading the priest.⁵¹ In March, a tailor's apprentice, who was overheard in a criticism which was judged to be heretical was expelled from the land, having beforehand been examined by a committee of

Ingolstadt professors.⁵² But there was trouble at the University itself. Two members of the faculty were denounced to the Dukes for having ignored Scripture in their lectures and read instead Erasmus' *Colloquia* and the Epistles of St. Paul. One of them was taken into custody. He was Arsacius Seehofer, a native of Munich, alumnus of Wittenberg and former student of Melanchthon's, now a master at Ingolstadt. It was also said about him that he denied freedom of the will. Wilhelm considered this a serious matter, as a dissemination of heterodox ideas at the university would be difficult to contain. He himself handled all the correspondence in the case, as well as its final disposition.⁵³ Seehofer was repeatedly interrogated. When letters of an incriminating nature were found in his rooms his twelve students were called up for examination. Finally he was forced to recant before the assembled University, then consigned to a safe monastery.⁵⁴

Another case which came up in March involved two apprentice bookbinders, one Valentin and one Hans Löffer. Both confessed to a number of specific charges of Lutheran heresy. The minutes of their interrogation were sent to Duke Wilhelm for his information and adjudication.⁵⁵ Valentin was examined first. What did he think of the Pope, he was asked. Pope, priest, Luther—they were all the same to him, he answered; no priest could save his soul for him. What did he think of indulgences? He cannot imagine of what use they are. Has he eaten meat on fast days? Yes, on Fridays, in Wittenberg, for his master there served nothing else. Finally, what did he think of Luther? He can say nothing bad of the man. When the questioning was done, witnesses were heard. One remembered a slighting remark about the Pope's power of excommunication, another an allegedly obscene joke about a sermon. Then Valentin was led from the room while the other defendant was interrogated. Both men were eventually expelled from Bavaria and forbidden to return.

Later in the summer some arrests took place in Burghausen, and there too expatriation was ordered.⁵⁶ In September action was taken against one of the most fearless members of Luther's advance guard, Argula von Grumbach, who had challenged the theologians of Ingolstadt to a debate on the question of Seehofer's guilt. Johann Eck sent her a distaff for an answer, but that did not end the matter for her. She warned the Duke himself of the consequences of his persecution and, for good measure, proposed that the surplus wealth of the clergy be confiscated to finance a Turkish campaign.⁵⁷ Wilhelm could hardly have been shocked at this suggestion, which had occurred to him too; but he reacted by relieving her husband, who had little sympathy for his wife's convictions, of his duties as *Pfleger*. Argula herself had to leave Bavaria.

Thus the year 1523 saw some determined attacks on the spreading heresy, though individual punishments were in no case severe,⁵⁸ and no disposition to annihilate the movement root and branch can be detected. All this was in accordance with the terms of the Religious Edict of the preceding year. An expression of papal pleasure came from Rome in June,⁵⁹ and this itself was a source of satisfaction to the Dukes, for negotiations for the visitation rights had now reached the critical stage. In March Dr. Johann Eck once again journeyed south to continue the talks with the Pope which had been interrupted by Leo's death, and he urged the Dukes to keep him posted on "what is currently being done at home in the Lutheran matter" in order to improve his bargaining position at the meetings.⁶⁰ Eck had been given detailed and specific instructions.⁶¹ He was, if possible, to obtain all of the following:

1. Freedom of action for the Dukes where the responsible bishops had not within a reasonable time proceeded against priests guilty of misdemeanors or crimes.
2. Ducal jurisdiction over clerics who committed reprehensible acts while disguised in lay clothes.
3. Appointment of a papal commission of two or three prelates in each of the four administrative Circles of the Duchy "to be judges and investigators in the name of His Holiness, possessing full powers to hold in prison all such clerical persons as shall have been delivered to them by Our officials, to defrock those who are found guilty and to hand them over to secular judges who will deal with them according to Imperial and Bavarian law." A list of prelates acceptable to the Dukes—native Bavarians all—was attached.
4. A declaration that no member of the clergy may hail a lay person under ducal jurisdiction into an ecclesiastical court for debt or other minor matters.
5. A curtailment of the passing out of sentences of excommunication for trivial offenses.
6. A Papal Bull empowering the Dukes to order visitations of monasteries by certain selected prelates and ducal officials for the purpose of correcting abuses and removing and replacing unsuitable abbots and priors.

None of these was an exorbitant request, and all had been previously granted to one or another territorial sovereign, as the Dukes pointed out in their comments. A more delicate matter was barely touched upon in the instructions: the current annual income of the bishops in and adjoining Bavaria (i.e., Salzburg, Augsburg, Passau, Freising, Regensburg, and Eichstt) together with that of their clergy was said to ex-

ceed that of Princes, nobility, and citizenry combined.⁶² The financial distress of the Duchy being well known to the Pope, Eck was to negotiate a tax on the Bavarian clergy.

Eck, after a lengthy delay caused, he wrote home, by Adrian's refusal to delegate any part of his duties,⁶³ began the presentation of his claims. He would not have been acting in character had he not exceeded his ambassadorial duties to speak in his own behalf of the larger issue of Church reform in Germany. For this latter purpose he composed during his stay in Rome a number of memoranda for the Pope's perusal.⁶⁴ In these, and, presumably, before the Pope, Eck minced no words in his condemnation of the decrepitude which had overtaken the Church in Germany. To revive it he suggests not a general Church Council, which would be rendered powerless by bickering among its national components, but instead a reactivation of the practice of holding annual diocesan and triennial provincial synods. The first provincial synod was to be convoked in Bavaria under the auspices of Duke Wilhelm. Meanwhile far-reaching and ruthless correctives were to restore the curia and the Church as a whole. Every effort was to be made to prevent an irrevocable split between the Church and the Lutherans—the real purpose of reform being to win them back.

The death of Pope Adrian in September once again changed the entire situation, but Eck was able to return to his sovereigns with papal permission to tax the Bavarian clergy up to one fifth of their income for the purposes of the Turkish campaigns, as well as with authorization to set up a Commission of Visitation on the Dukes' terms.⁶⁵ In Munich a sense of relief and elation must have prevailed. There was certainly every reason to be satisfied with the policy pursued so far.

IV

But still the Lutherans or suspected Lutherans multiplied in Bavaria. Their preachers and their books came from places where the Dukes had no direct power: the imperial cities of Augsburg and Regensburg, and the little principalities Haag, Ortenburg, and Miesbach-Hohenwaldeck which were under imperial jurisdiction. Regensburg especially was a thorn in their flesh. A determined band of Lutherans steadily gained strength there,⁶⁶ and the City Council was openly sympathetic.⁶⁷ Luther's sermons were reprinted and distributed by Regensburg booksellers.⁶⁸ In the summer of 1524 the ambassador of Electoral Saxony saw some Lutheran writings sold openly on the streets of Munich.⁶⁹ There was no concealing the unpleasant fact that the control measures so far undertaken had not checked the spread of the revolt. Evidence of anxiety at Rome came from Cardinal Campeggi

who reminded the Dukes in May that they were still delinquent in their enforcement of the papal and imperial edicts.⁷⁰

Campeggi was on his way to Regensburg where the Archduke Ferdinand had called a meeting of princes and prelates in the territories surrounding Austria for the purpose of joining in more effective measures against the Lutherans.⁷¹ The sessions were held in late June and early July, 1524. Wilhelm and Ludwig attended for only five days, and not until October did they decide to publish their own orders implementing the agreements which had been reached.⁷² But their conversations with the papal legate and with the Archduke must have convinced them of the advisability of common action. Referring to the comprehensive papal reform program for Germany announced at Regensburg by Cardinal Campeggi,⁷³ the Dukes now stated their firm resolve to stand by Pope and Emperor, and in a general directive, charged their officials again to carry out all papal, imperial, and ducal mandates which had come to them. In order to dispel any remaining uncertainty, there followed a number of specific decrees:⁷⁴

No printer is henceforth to publish any book or pamphlet without previous official examination and approval. Nor may any of the forbidden heretical writings be bought, sold, given away, or otherwise distributed in the ducal lands.

All Bavarians now studying at Wittenberg are to depart from there within three months.⁷⁵ No person who has studied at Wittenberg may hold ecclesiastical office or a university appointment in Bavaria.⁷⁶

No one is to be permitted to preach in any church without having been examined and pronounced sound by his Bishop, and holding a written certificate to that effect. No soap box preachers will be tolerated.

Escaped monks who have taken wives are to be expelled forthwith.

No change is to be condoned in the celebration of Holy Communion. No one is to receive Holy Communion without having first confessed and obtained absolution. Fast days are to be held as prescribed by the Church.

In accordance with Campeggi's recommendation and the decisions made at Regensburg, the Dukes appointed a number of special commissioners who were, in association with regular administrative personnel, to keep the whole land under surveillance and to take malefactors into custody. Bavaria either had then, or developed in response to this challenge, an effective system of internal security, an organization which proved its value in 1525 when the borders were quickly sealed and budding agrarian revolts suppressed efficiently.⁷⁷ Once again the Dukes explicitly reserved to themselves alone the right to decide on proceedings and declare punishments. They agreed not to give asylum to any person expelled as a heretic from the territories of another signatory; however, notable through its absence from the promulgation was that provision of the Regensburg agreement which sought to ob-

lige signatories to aid each other when endangered by rebellious subjects. We see again that Wilhelm and Ludwig, prompted no doubt by their prescient chancellor, insisted on retaining the utmost freedom of action. A Bavarian religious policy implementing political, if not confessional, principles was in process of formulation, but it was one based on purely indigenous considerations.

Wilhelm's correspondence reveals him busily occupied with the handling of cases that were referred to him through administrative channels. He kept in touch with his officials and gave prompt acknowledgement to their reports.⁷⁸ Voluminous dossiers piled up. Most interesting about these records is what they tell us about Wilhelm's methods of investigation. There was no witch hunting in Bavaria; no one was condemned without a careful evaluation of all the evidence. The affair of Bernhard Tichtl, or Tichtler, a judicial officer at Starnberg before his dismissal, is a case in point.⁷⁹ Late in 1524 Tichtl was denounced by an Ingolstadt professor to whom he had made some unguarded remarks about the plight of Lutherans in Bavaria. He was arrested and placed in the Falkenturm in Munich. The charge was itemized and declared true by Tichtl. He also admitted to several discussions and a disputation on Lutheran articles (both forbidden by the Religious Edict of 1522, it will be remembered). Examination of witnesses to these discussions yielded a transcript of long conversations, repeated in detail and from an apparently fresh memory. The report was then analyzed and heretical articles laid to Tichtl by the witnesses extracted. Thirty-six of these were placed before Tichtl who admitted and recanted them one by one. Meanwhile, Wilhelm's father-in-law, the Margrave of Baden, had addressed Wilhelm with an entreaty for Tichtl's release which was promptly answered, and Tichtl himself petitioned the Duke with three compendious writings. A final brief of the proceedings was drawn up. Wilhelm was now ready to pass judgment, and on February 13, 1925, less than two months after his internment, Tichtl was released after payment of a fine of 1,000 florins.

Recantation was the major prerequisite for release from the ducal prisons. The Augsburg patrician Georg Regel got himself and his family off for 2,000 florins after admitting his lapse.⁸⁰ One Georg Vogel and his wife Anna confessed contritely to having eaten meat on fast days and to having received Communion under both forms. Their sentences were revoked by Wilhelm.⁸¹ Another, Erhard Gugler, a twice-convicted heretic, recanted once more, and again the pleas of his wife and children moved the Duke (as Gugler recalls in a lachrymose letter of gratitude) to commute his sentence to expulsion.⁸² Leonhard Pirckheimer, a preacher in Otting, confessed to having included Lutheran articles in his sermons. He too was let go after pronouncing the

formal declaration of renunciation: He had accepted the Lutheran and new teachings against all the commands of the true Christian religion and the papal, imperial, and ducal mandates. For this he has been put in prison. He now condemns his own action, renounces his adherence to a vile heresy, and vows his steadfast intention to be true to the venerable Christian traditions. Furthermore, he agrees to leave Bavaria and never to return to within ten miles of her borders, nor enter the territory of any of those princes and prelates who support the decisions of the Council of Regensburg. So help him God.⁸³

Reckoned quantitatively, the number of men and women expelled from Bavaria in 1524 and 1525, or otherwise disciplined, is not significant.⁸⁴ But it is likely that through careful and deliberate detection and prosecution most of the potential trouble makers were isolated. The absence of organized and influential groups of religious dissenters certainly contributed to the relative calm which persisted in Bavaria during the peasant uprisings which broke out all around the Duchy in Swabia, Franconia, Upper Austria, Salzburg, and Tirol in 1525.⁸⁵ To most contemporaries of these unhappy events there was only one interpretation of the ideological roots of this rebellion.⁸⁶ "All this has no other cause than that Lutheran heresy," Chancellor Eck assured his Dukes,⁸⁷ though other voices were not lacking which counselled Wilhelm to meet the peasants' wishes half way.⁸⁸ Had Aventinus' *Bavarian Chronicle* been available to him then, it is not likely that Wilhelm would have remained untouched by his official historian's evocation of the monotony, degradation, and hopelessness of peasant life in Germany. But Wilhelm listened to Eck, and there is no doubt that determined action was called for if the spreading revolt was to be kept out of Bavaria, though Eck's plan for demonstrative cruelty in dealing with captives—his policy of deterrent effect—⁸⁹ seems excessive now. Eck's contempt for his lowly adversaries was such that he was convinced that a stout heart and a firm front were sufficient to defeat them.⁹⁰ The social gospel of the peasant movement and, he assumed, of Luther's, was detestable to him. "I want nothing of their brotherly love," he declared. "I have never been tempted to share my possessions with my next-of-kin, to say nothing of strangers and peasants."⁹¹ There is little chance, he comments sarcastically, that Mr. Fugger will be so brotherly as to divide with him. Before long every one, even peasant oafs, will see from the fruits of the Lutheran heresy what kind of tree it is they grow on.⁹² "Then we will snuff out their hellish gospel!"⁹³

It is likely that Eck saw in the peasant uprisings the turning point of the whole Lutheran rebellion. He had always warned of the inescapable political consequences of an individualistic religious creed. Here now was the proof. Johann Eck, too, had been arguing this position,

and, to support it, had culled a number of anti-authoritarian remarks from Luther's writings.⁹⁴ When the peasant wars came to an end and Bavaria had been spared the devastation of neighboring lands, all concerned could congratulate themselves on the determination with which rebelliousness had been resisted. It is customary to cite in this connection the taunt of the controversialist Johann Cochlaeus to Luther: "Had all our Princes been as diligent as the Bavarian Dukes in driving out your books and your disciples, their peasants would have remained as peaceful as those in Bavaria."

In Bavaria's relations with the papacy this diligence continued to be played as a trump card in the diplomatic game for control of the monasteries. Beyond this there now commenced an attempt to recover some of the financial losses sustained in the pursuit of the Dukes' and Eck's political schemes by charging them to the struggle against the Lutherans.⁹⁵ But the years 1525, 1526, and most of 1527 showed little drive toward "the extirpation of heretical practice," which Wilhelm had promised Rome.⁹⁶ Even a priest who, in March 1526, was indicted for having told his peasant congregation in Sielenbach that the relic at a near-by shrine was really the bone of a hanged criminal,⁹⁷ was set free by Wilhelm with no other penalty than the loss of his parish. A little nest of Lutherans at Wasserburg was cleared out,⁹⁸ a renewed effort to hunt down illicit preachers and gospel interpreters was made,⁹⁹ and a more permanent foundation for the control of heresy was laid by the announcement of a plan to improve primary and secondary education.¹⁰⁰ The Dukes watched with some concern the growing Lutheranism of Regensburg,¹⁰¹ but they refused to stand against the tide, even when requested to do so by the Administrator.¹⁰²

It is probable that once again high political considerations intervened to bring about a relaxation in prosecution, though not in vigilance. In the course of 1526, the uneasy relations between the Dukes and their Habsburg cousins broke into open hostility, and the Dukes could not, in a time of shifting policies and alliances, afford to destroy all their bridges to the other camp. With Chancellor Eck it was axiomatic that possibilities of approach and detachment must always be open. Eck had convinced himself that the Emperor, and more especially his brother Ferdinand, were intent on keeping Bavaria encircled, squeezing at every point where pressure could be brought to bear.¹⁰³ "If ever a Prince of Austria has had designs on our Duchy, he is it," Eck warned Wilhelm of Ferdinand.¹⁰⁴ But mere defense went against Eck's grain. The struggle he waged challenged the Habsburgs on the major political battlefields. In September his agents were bargaining in Prague, where the crown of Bohemia might be procured for Ludwig,¹⁰⁵ simultaneously he pursued what he regarded as the climactic objective

of his stewardship, the election of Wilhelm as King of the Romans. The pillage of Rome by Charles' troops in May of 1527 improved Wilhelm's chances, and Eck undertook far-ranging negotiations. Both attempts turned out magnificent failures, but both necessitated the kind of agile diplomacy in which a zealous and unswerving religious policy could have no part. Also, since Wilhelm insisted on handling all religious investigations himself, a lull during these busy and tense months was natural. In any case, the surviving records inform us about no more than a handful of cases of heresy exposed and judged until the autumn of 1527.

V

It was the appearance of the brotherhood of Anabaptists on Bavarian soil which abruptly ended this period of inaction. From then on, until the menace from this new Hydra-head of the rebellion had been terminated, persecution, not only of extremists, but of all persons of doubtful loyalty, became incisive, thorough, and merciless. For the first time one senses conviction behind the Dukes' acts.

Since the summer disquieting news of the gathering of Baptists in neighboring regions, especially in Augsburg and Salzburg, had come to Munich. On the subject of the internal threat posed by these "garden brethren," as they were called from their clandestine nocturnal meetings in the gardens beyond the city walls, there was no disagreement among governments. It is most probably this awakened consciousness of danger which explains three executions of heretics, not necessarily themselves Anabaptists, which took place in Bavaria in February, June, and August, the first capital punishments which can be documented. One Leonhard Käser, or Kaiser, a fugitive priest who returned to Bavaria for his father's last illness, was arrested and later burned at the stake by order of Duke Wilhelm. Another, Georg Wagner, refused to let his new-born child be baptized, and, when challenged, maintained further that he saw no value in the Eucharist. He too was burned.¹⁰⁶ At about the same time a cutler named Ambrose created a disturbance in the Frauenkirche in Munich, shouting that "God Almighty is not in this bread and cannot be put into it. It is nothing but a piece of bread." He was at once put under lock and key, condemned to the stake, but "went into himself, renounced his sin, and begged for clemency." His sentence was commuted to beheading. Soon afterwards he was seen being led to the block, calm and at peace with himself. He traced a cross on the ground, knelt on it, and offered his head.¹⁰⁷ The sentences applied in these three cases soon became standard: the stake for unregenerate heretics, beheading or, if a woman, drowning, for those who recanted.¹⁰⁸

In November 1527 the persecutions began in earnest. Early that month, according to the ever-alert Johann Eck,¹⁰⁹ some Baptist apostles had arrived at the Bavarian borders. They apparently found a fertile field for their labors. On November 6, Eck reports, a Baptist group of eleven men and sixteen women was discovered in a farm house half a mile from Salzburg. The Cardinal, who, according to Eck, still had not grasped the seriousness of the peril, allowed twenty-one who recanted to go free, though the others were shut inside the house, which was then burned to the ground.¹¹⁰ On the 10th, the Cardinal offered a general amnesty, of which twenty-five women and sixteen men took advantage. In the territories of the Dukes, however, there was now no disposition to be soft-hearted. Eck reports with approval that as early as November 4 two men were burned to death and two beheaded, that a certain Leonhard Spörle, who had been sent from Augsburg to make converts in Bavaria, was quickly caught and sent to the block, and that of eighteen men imprisoned in Burghausen all were beheaded. One of the latter was a castle guard who had been drunk and out of his senses when he submitted to his second baptism. Still he was ordered executed, for, Eck adds in a telling comment, "my gracious Lord is of the opinion that no one becomes a Baptist who has not previously become a Lutheran. Nor do the Anabaptists approach anyone but a Lutheran." The last is surely an admission that Lutheranism had been far from annihilated in Bavaria.

But by now Wilhelm was thoroughly aroused. His Chancellor's warnings of the ultimate forms which the Lutheran revolt would take appeared to have come true: "a corruption, rejection, and destruction of all sacraments," and the corrosion of civic law and authority; a denial, above all, of those virtues of rectitude, order, and respectability so honored by Bavarians. He resolved to declare war on the heresy in all its guises. On the 15th of November, a sternly worded Second Religious Edict issued from Munich.¹¹¹ In order to establish continuity of policy, it repeated some essential passages from the Religious Edict of 1522 and the general directive of 1524,¹¹² and then identified the present danger:

For now a new sect of men, called Anabaptists, have come within our borders, and with them a corruption, rejection, and destruction of all sacraments, as well as numerous other evil, unchristian, and inhuman practices.

The methods announced for detection and apprehension reveal the nonsense mood which now prevailed; rewards of 32 Gulden for denunciation leading to the capture of a Baptist, and of 20 Gulden for a Lutheran, and the most severe penalties to follow conviction. Simultaneously Wilhelm had authorization sent to ducal officials, permitting them to hold investigations of all persons accused of Anabaptism.¹¹³

Imprisoned Baptists were to be held in separate cells so that none would find support or encouragement from others.¹¹⁴ Anyone found sheltering a suspected sectarian must be arrested. Immediate written notification was to be made to the Dukes of all action taken.

That Leonhard von Eck was behind these stringent measures is shown by a letter which he drafted for Wilhelm to send to his brother Ludwig, whom the Chancellor found not nearly effective enough in driving heretics from his administrative districts. "Do not fail to realize," Wilhelm duly wrote on November 17th, "that a creed which allows each man to interpret his faith according to his taste and will must breed civil disobedience and ultimately rebellion and bloodshed."¹¹⁵ Rumor has it, Wilhelm goes on, "and perhaps it is the truth, that Lutheran and other teachings find ready entry into Your Grace's districts and towns. . . . Wherefore I would ask Your Grace to be henceforth more observant . . . so that with patience and determination we may keep our land and our people free from misfortune." Eck's studies of the role of the Anabaptists among the peasant insurgents elsewhere must have convinced him that he now faced an organized conspiracy. When, therefore, some time later, groups of Baptists were discovered sailing down the Danube on rafts, there was devised a more systematic method of investigation, a part of which consisted of a questionnaire (*Fragstück*)¹¹⁶ to be answered in writing by each prisoner:

Who is he (or she), where does he come from and what is his destination? How did he come to Bavaria, and why? What is his position on infant baptism? Who converted him to Anabaptism, and where and when? Has he himself made converts? What is his opinion of the Mass? Has he received Holy Communion within the year? What are the customs of his sect; particularly, how do Baptists arrange for the community of all possessions? Does he know of any secret Baptists in Bavaria? Are other individuals or groups following his trail? Is he resolved to resist or to undermine law and authority? Does he advocate the overthrow of government by force and violence?¹¹⁷ Is his group planning to meet other members of their sect, and if so, where? Does he know that Bavarian laws forbid the existence of his sect, and is he aware of the penalty for non-compliance? Has he been punished or expelled elsewhere?

Enforcement of the decrees and laws now came swiftly and with the utmost severity. At the time of issue of the new Edict three men and three women were in detention at Burghausen; all were executed.¹¹⁸ On Sunday, December 23rd, 1527 nine men were beheaded in Landsberg.¹¹⁹ Two teamsters were put to death in Munich, one by the sword, the other at the stake.¹²⁰ Around the first of the new year the Emperor issued his own Mandate against Anabaptists from Speier.¹²¹ Charles' interpretation of the true object of the sect was that of the Dukes: "Many of these people have no other ambition than to use their false religion as a cloak from under which to carry on the most monstrous ravage and destruction of civil law and order, of authority, in-

deed of all propriety." The pace of persecution was stepped up. In January alone a citizen of Munich might have observed twenty-nine men being drowned in the Isar, six steadfast artisans burned after a secret trial, and two of their wives, unswerving as their husbands, condemned to the stake, but permitted to suffer death by drowning before being burned.¹²² Further executions were ordered elsewhere in the Duchy. Even the chronicler of the Anabaptist persecution in Bavaria, Andreas Perneder, lost count. "A great multitude of persons was tried and condemned," he merely writes of the later months of the year 1528.¹²³ In some cases special circumstances led to a full pardon, but these were rare for convicted Baptists.¹²⁴ A persistent effort was made to keep on the trail of preachers sent to proselytize,¹²⁵ for example one Augustin Tucher, who used his brother's butcher shop in Landshut as a front for his missionary work. Tucher escaped to Regensburg and was executed there in October upon insistent demands of the Dukes.¹²⁶

Meanwhile there was no slackening in the campaign against real or alleged Lutherans. To Wilhelm these were, as we have seen, pliable subjects for the Baptist agents. Special measures were ordered against itinerant Lutheran preachers who slipped across the borders from Augsburg, Ulm, and Regensburg. Now at last the Dukes decided to cooperate with the Administrator of Regensburg in his efforts to suppress the Lutherans there,¹²⁷ the city itself not having taken adequate measures against the Anabaptist danger. It was there that Aventinus sought asylum in August after the arrest of two of his Bavarian associates. Aventinus had been under surveillance since the spring when he opened his home in Abensberg to Erhard Zänkl, the first monk in Regensburg to discard his robes and take a wife, and a notorious person to the orthodox.¹²⁸ Soon after that two of his acquaintances were seized, in May Georg Fabri, Duke Ludwig's court chaplain, in July Christoph Achster, a priest in Kelheim. Both were charged with Lutheran sympathies. In Regensburg Aventinus apparently participated in colloquies among various advocates of the new faith.¹²⁹ In October, following a temporary abatement of prosecutions in Bavaria, he returned home. On the seventh the Dukes, who now no longer were willing to take chances, had him arrested.

Thus ended the first decade of Protestantism in Bavaria. To the Dukes and their industrious Chancellor it was surely a source of deep satisfaction that their land had been spared the divisive and debilitating consequences of a territory rent by religious strife. In retrospective contemplation of the ten years just concluded they could reflect with pleasure that their cautious and far from immoderate measures had brought them success on many fronts. The cost of all this, to be sure, had been high, and the ducal treasures were near exhaustion. In 1549,

not long before his death, Wilhelm was compelled to turn to the Pope for aid, extending an offer of his personal jewelry for purchase.¹³⁰ For twenty-eight years, he writes, his government has been in a constant state of mobilization against the enemies of the faith. The cost of this preparedness he estimates at 25,000 gold gulden yearly.¹³¹ Was this too high a price for what had been achieved? It is improbable that Wilhelm thought so in 1528. His Duchy was entire. The administrative powers in his hands had been strengthened. Revolution and dissension had been averted. The prestige of his House stood high. The future could be faced with confidence.

1. Aventinus, "Haus-Kalender," *Johannes Turmairs genannt Aventinus Sämtliche Werke*, VI (Munich, 1908), 45.
2. *Ibid.*, 44-45.
3. Leonhard Theobald, *Die Reformationsgeschichte der Reichsstadt Regensburg* (Munich, 1936), 164 ff.
4. Between 1526 and 1529 he himself sent the manuscript of the most anti-clerical of his writings, the booklet on the Turkish wars, to various authorities in the hope of arousing them to concerted military action. Cf. "Türkenkrieg," *Aventinus I* (Munich 1880), 218.
5. Cf. Aventinus' own statement, *Ibid.*, 186.
6. *Ein warnus und anzaiung der ursach, warumb got der her dem Türken . . . so vil sigs wider uns christen gebe . . . Aventinus*, I, 171-242.
7. Cf. entry in the "Haus-Kalender," *Aventinus*, VI, 45. Cf. also Leonhard von Eck's letter to the Dukes, *Ibid.*, I, 2 page L.
8. On the approval by the Estates of this rule, and its endorsement by the Emperor Maximilian, see Sigmund Riezler, *Geschichte Baierns* III (Gotha, 1896), 641 ff.
9. Franz von Krenner, *Baierische Landtags-Handlungen in den Jahren 1429-1513*, XVII (Munich, 1805), 9 ff. On the period generally see Sigmund Riezler, *op. cit.*, volumes III-IV.
10. Actually it was suspicion of the motives of their uncle, the Emperor Maximilian, which ultimately prompted Wilhelm and Ludwig to end their quarrel. Cf. Riezler, IV, 9-27 on the Emperor's influence and on the settlement worked out by the brothers.
11. See the detailed but unfriendly study of Eck's career by Wilhelm Vogt, *Die bayrische Politik im Bauernkrieg und der Kanzler Dr. Leonhard von Eck* (Nördlingen, 1883), chapter 1.
12. This was the war of the Swabian League, of which Wilhelm was Ober-
- feldherr*, with Ulrich of Württemberg, precipitated by Ulrich's attack on the member city of Reutlingen.
13. See the series of memoranda from Eck to Duke Wilhelm, discussed by August von Druffel, "Die bairische Politik im Beginne der Reformationszeit, 1519-1524," *Abhandl. d. hist. Cl. d. kgl.-bayer. Ak. d. Wiss.*, XVII, Abt. 3 (1886), 611-612.
14. See letters of 17 November and 7 December 1520, *ibid.*, Dokument No. 4.
15. Wilhelm Zimmermann, *Geschichte des grossen Bauernkrieges* (Naunhof and Leipzig, 1939), I, 247.
16. Eck to Wilhelm, 25 February 1525; Vogt, 395-396. See also Wilhelm's letter to Ludwig of November 1527; note 115 below.
17. Correspondence of the Dukes with Albrecht of Brandenburg, 1517-1518; *Bayerisches Hauptstaatsarchiv*, Munich (from now on cited as *BHM*) *Fürstensachen* 338. The Dukes pleaded two recent indulgences in Bavaria as well as an increase in the cost of living.
18. Matthias Simon, *Evangelische Kirchengeschichte Bayerns* I (Munich, 1942), 161-162.
19. Communication to the bishops of Salzburg, Freising, Regensburg, Passau, and Eichstätt, 11 March 1521; Vogt, 46. Cf. also August von Druffel, "Über die Aufnahme der Bulle 'Exsurge Domine' — Leo X gegen Luther — von Seiten einiger süddeutschen Bischöfe," *Sitzb. d. philol-hist. Cl. d. Akad. d. Wiss.*, (Munich, 1880), 575 ff.
20. Wilhelm describes their reception in Worms in a letter to Eck; Druffel, *Dokument* No. 5.
21. ". . . ich wais E. F. G. schicklichkeit wol, wenn E. F. G. sich der hendl annemen und nit faul sein wollen." Eck to Wilhelm, February 1521; Druffel, 678.
22. *Ibid.*, 620.

23. Franz Dittrich, *Regesten und Briefe des Cardinals Gasparo Contarini* (Braunsberg, 1881), 253.
24. Druffel, *Dokument No. 11*.
25. Wilhelm to Ludwig in 1513. See note 26.
26. Instructions for this plea were drawn up for Ludwig by Wilhelm. *Geheimes Hausarchiv*, Munich, *Korrespondenzakten* No. 583.
27. Cf the statement in Ernst's testament: "... aber nichtte unser will und mainnung gewest, Briester zuwerden, oder in disem standt zu pleiben," *BHM Fürstensachen* No. 319. Cf. also Karl August Muffat, "Die Ansprüche des Herzog Ernst . . . auf einen dritten Teil und an die Mitregierung des Herzogthumes Bayern," *Abhandl. d. hist. Cl. d. kgl.-bayer. Ak. d. Wiss.* (Munich, 1867), 190 ff.
28. Vogt, 279.
29. Druffel, 622. At the time the Dukes were able to obtain only the provostship of Eichstädt. The election as Bishop came in 1526 through the offices of Clement VII. Cf. Gustav Wolf, "Die bayerische Bistumspolitik in der ersten Hälfte des 16. Jahrhunderts . . .," *Beiträge zur bayerischen Kirchengeschichte VI* (1899-1900), 146. In 1523 the attempt to gain the coadjutorship was renewed when Johann Eck was asked to intercede with the Pope. Cf. Wilhelm's letter to Eck, 6 February 1523, printed by Theodor Wiedemann, *Dr. Johann Eck*, (Regensburg, 1865) 659-660.
30. The way to the election was cleared by a secret agreement between the incumbent, Cardinal Matthäus Lang, and the Dukes during and after the peasant insurrection in Salzburg in 1525. Cf. Albert Hollaender, "Studien zum Salzburger Bauernkrieg 1525 mit besonderer Berücksichtigung der reichsfürstlichen Sonderpolitik," *Mitt. d. Gesellsch. f. Salzb. Landeskunde* 72 (1932).
31. Carl Prantl, *Geschichte der Ludwig-Maximilians-Universität in Ingolstadt* (Munich, 1872), I, 148.
32. Druffel, 625 ff. Eck's draft with additions and corrections in *BHM Staatsverwaltung* 2778, 45 recto-46 verso; 48 recto. Of the published *Religionsmandat* there are many exemplars. Druffel printed one among his *Dokumente*, page 689 ff.
33. Simon I, 206.
34. A *Pfleger* was an official whose duties combined judicial and administrative functions.
35. Documents of the case in *BHM Staatsverwaltung* 2778, 26.
36. Druffel, 634.
37. *Ibid.*, 633-635.
38. Romuald Bauerreiss, *Kirchengeschichte Bayerns* V, 42-44.
39. Cf. Johann Eck's suggestions for Church reform in Germany, made to Pope Adrian VI in 1523, for a discussion of corruption and irregularities. Eck's notes were published by Walter Friedensburg, "Dr. Johann Ecks Denkschriften zur deutschen Kirchenreformation," *Beiträge zur bayerischen Kirchengeschichte II* (1896), 159 ff.; 222 ff.
40. For a contemporary account of these visits of Albrecht in the 1440's cf. Lorenz Westenrieder, *Beyträge zur vaterl. Historie . . .* (Munich, 1788-1817), V, 38 ff.
41. Simon I, 153-154.
42. Bauerreiss V, 68-71.
43. Vitus Anton Winter, *Geschichte der Schicksale der evangelischen Lehre in und durch Baiern* (Munich, 1809), II, 325; Vogt, 50.
44. He never failed to arrange for a colleague to take over his lectures when his many undertakings required his absence from Ingolstadt. Letter to Wilhelm, 14 April 1526; *BHM Staatsverwaltung* 2778, 42.
45. Druffel, 630 ff.
46. Ludwig to Wilhelm, 21 October and 6 November 1522; *BHM Staatsverwaltung* 2719, No. 5; Druffel, 637.
47. Adrian to Dukes; *BHM Staatsverwaltung* 2719, No. 3. Answer from Ludwig, 16 January 1523; *ibid.*, No. 4.
48. On the Nuremberg Diet cf. *Deutsche Reichstagsakten*, Jüngere Reihe, III (Gotha, 1901).
49. *Ibid.*; Carl Theodor Gemeiner, *Reichsstadt Regensburgische Chronik* (Regensburg, 1800-1824) IV, 480-481.
50. Draft and printed copy in *BHM Staatsverwaltung* 2778, 40.
51. Simon I, 173; Druffel, 641.
52. Druffel, 644.
53. His draft letters and some other documents pertaining to the case in *BHM Staatsverwaltung* 2778, 38-39, 34.
54. A "versperrt, reformirt closter." It was Ettal, from which Seehofer later escaped to become a Lutheran minister in Augsburg.
55. The documents relating to this case are in *BHM Staatsverwaltung*, 2778, 34-36.
56. *Ibid.*, 5-6, 44.
57. The letters and related documents were printed by Felix Joseph Lipowsky, *Argula von Grumbach* (Munich, 1801), *Beilagen* I, III, and VI.
58. Winter I, 174, reports the beheading of a baker's apprentice, accused of Lutheranism, in Munich in July. But it is not likely that the offense was purely religious.
59. Letter to Dukes, 15 June 1523; *BHM Staatsverwaltung* 2719, No. 2.
60. Eck to Dukes, 1 May 1523; *Geheimes Staatsarchiv*, Munich, 311/12. The

- Dukes responded, but too late for Eck to make use of the information in his talks with Adrian. Cf. Wilhelm's letter to Eck, 1 November 1523, printed by Theodor Wiedemann, *Dr. Johann Eck*, 664-667.
61. "Verzaichnus, was Doctor Johann Egkius . . . an stat unnd zu namen unserer gn. herrn, H. Wilhelm unnd H. Ludwig in Bairn bei Babstlicher Heiligkeit hanndlen sol," *BHM Oefeleana* 26, 33 recto—43 recto.
 62. *Ibid.*, 34 recto and verso.
 63. "Es gen wol alle ding langsam und verdriesslich zu, dass menigklich drob klagt: ursach, das der babst lutzet hat, damit er alle ding aussricht: braucht sich keins cardinals, seien ir allain 4 die das kleinst und das grösst aussrichten: so wil der babst alle ding selbst sehn. Bei Babst Leon hat man ain wochen viel ausgericht, das jetz viel zeit darf dazu." Eck to Wilhelm, 1 May 1523; *Geheimes Hausarchiv*, Munich, 311/12.
 64. Published by Friedensburg. Cf. note 39 above.
 65. Wilhelm and Ludwig to Eck, 1 November 1523; printed by Wiedemann, 664-667.
 66. Theobald, 109.
 67. *Ibid.*; *Gemeiner IV*, 471 ff.
 68. Theobald, 110 ff. By 1523 the printer Paul Kohl had reprinted twelve of Luther's sermons. The booksellers Kaspar Schreiber and Hans öttl handled these and others.
 69. *Gemeiner IV*, 510.
 70. Letters to Wilhelm and Ludwig, 8 May 1524; *BHM Staatsverwaltung* 2778, 51, 53.
 71. For a full account of the meeting see *Gemeiner IV*, 513 ff.
 72. *Lanndpot im hertzogthum Obern unnd Nydern Bayrn wider die Lüttheranschen Sect*, dated Munich, 2 October. The corrected draft of this decree is in *BHM Staatsverwaltung* 2778, 89-112.
 73. This was printed and circulated in the territories of those who attended the council. A copy is in *BHM Staatsverwaltung* 2778, 65 recto—72 verso. As read by Campeggi, it was to be the most exhaustive attempt at reform yet undertaken. It included Johann Eck's suggestion for provincial and diocesan synods.
 74. These were given in the *Lanndpot* and also separately. A collection of them is in *BHM Staatsverwaltung* 2772.
 75. In 1518 thirteen Bavarian students matriculated at Wittenberg, in 1519 thirty-four, in 1520 sixty. Simon I, 164. After 1520 the number fell. *Alb um Academias Vitebergensis* (Leipzig, 1841). Other territorial governments had begun to recall their students in 1522. See the Instruction from the Elector Frederick of Saxony to Johann Oswald, 26 February, 1522, *D. Martin Luthers Werke* (Weimar edition), *Briefwechsel*, vol. II, p. 450.
 76. In primary and secondary schools, Wittenberg graduates were distrusted, but not removed unless they showed definite Lutheran proclivities. The records of the great Bavarian visitation of 1558-1560, printed by Georg Lurz, *Mittelschulgeschichtliche Dokumente Altbayerns* . . . (Berlin, 1907-1908; *Monumenta Germaniae Paedagogica*, XLI-XLII) I, 251 ff., reveal many former Wittenberg students teaching in Bavaria.
 77. Vogt, 135 f.
 78. *BHM Staatsverwaltung* 2778, 123 recto—124 recto; *Ibid.* for a typical case.
 79. *Ibid.*, 124 verso—146 recto.
 80. Simon, 177.
 81. *BHM Staatsverwaltung* 2778, 121.
 82. *Ibid.*, 177.
 83. *Ibid.*, 162-166.
 84. Due to the scattering of the material from this period among the various Bavarian archives, it is difficult to arrive at a reliable quantitative estimate of the prosecutions. But because the investigations had to be supervised by Wilhelm personally it is likely that the great majority, and certainly the most important, of cases have come down to us.
 85. On the general subject of the peasant wars in Bavaria see the works by Zimmermann, Vogt, and Riezler already cited. Also Franz Ludwig Baumann, *Akten zur Geschichte des deutschen Bauernkrieges aus Oberschwaben* (Freiburg i. B., 1877).
 86. Vogt, chapter 3.
 87. Letter from Eck, 25 May 1525; *ibid.*, 456.
 88. The Bavarian Councillor Sebastian Schilling was one. Cf. Schilling to Wilhelm, 13 March 1525; Zimmerman I, 252.
 89. Letters to Wilhelm of 29 April, 3 May, 25 May 1525; Vogt, 448, 452, 454.
 90. Letter of 13 April 1525; Vogt, 431. Again, 29 April; *ibid.*, 448.
 91. Eck to Wilhelm, 9 March 1525; *ibid.*, 408.
 92. Eck to Wilhelm, 22 February, 1525; *ibid.*, 393.
 93. Eck to Wilhelm, 9 March 1525; *ibid.*, 408.
 94. *BHM Staatsverwaltung* 2778, 86 recto and verso.
 95. Cf. the drafts of two letters of Wilhelm to Clement VII, 15 and 16 December 1525; *Geheimes Staatsarchiv*, Munich, 311/12. Also Wilhelm's letter to Johann Eck, 19 October 1523, written upon receipt of the news of the death of Adrian VI, in which the Duke indicated his hopes for finan-

- cial support from the new pontiff. Printed by Wiedemann, 667-670.
96. Letter of 15 December; *Geheimes Staatsarchiv*, 311/12.
97. Confession and recantation of Wolfgang Hackenschmitt, 6 March 1526; *BHM. Staatsverwaltung* 2778, 169.
98. Wilhelm mentions this in his draft letter of 15 December to Clement.
99. Decree signed by Wilhelm and Ludwig in 1526; *BHM. Staatsverwaltung* 2778, No. 20.
100. 1526 saw the first ducal mandate on inspection of schools and compulsory school attendance. See Lurz, I, 206-208. School reform continued to be one of Wilhelm's concerns. Cf. Lurz, especially I, 234-236.
101. Gemeiner IV, 533 ff. *BHM Staatsverwaltung* 2729 is a collection of letters and reports to Wilhelm and Ludwig relating to the spread of Lutheranism in Regensburg and Ulm.
102. Theobald, 173-174. During the disturbances of 1525 the City Council had compelled the clergy to accept taxation and the imposition of some civic duties. In September 1527 the Administrator called on certain ecclesiastical and secular rulers to meet with the Council in order to persuade its members to revoke these burdens. The Bavarian Dukes refused to attend.
103. According to Vogt, 357, Ferdinand's occupation of the city of Flüssen was the turning point for Eck. On the politics of the entire period, cf. Andreas Sebastian Stumpf, *Politische Geschichte von Bayern* I (Munich, 1813).
104. Vogt, 362.
105. Stumpf I, 39 ff.
106. Andreas Perneder, *Verzaichnus, was sich sonderlich in Bayern von 1506 bis aufs 1529. jar, besonders im Baurn Krieg, Türkisch Zug, und das wider tauffern begeben*. Bayerische Staatsbibliothek, Munich, *Cod. germ. 1594*, 47 verso. See also Simon I, 209.
107. Perneder, 48 recto and verso.
108. Women were ordinarily sewn into a sack, thrown in the river, and held under by the executioner with a long pole. Cf. Gemeiner, IV, 442 for a description.
109. Johann Eck to Duke Georg of Saxony, 26 November 1527; Simon I, 198 ff.
110. *Ibid.* Cf. Joseph Schmid, "Des Cardinals und Erzbischofs von Salzburg Matthäus Lang Verhalten zur Reformation," *Jahrb. d. Ges. f. d. Gesch. d. Protestantismus in Oesterreich* XXIX (1898).
111. Draft in *BHM Staatsverwaltung* 2778, 179-181.
112. Cf. note 72 above.
113. *BHM Staatsverwaltung* 2778, 184.
114. *BHM Staatsverwaltung* 2843, no signatures on leaves. This is perhaps of a slightly later date.
115. The letter is given by Perneder, 25 recto—26 recto. Perneder identifies Leonhard von Eck as the author, 26 recto.
116. *BHM Fürstensachen* 34, 7-8.
117. "Ob sy mit verstand oder anschlag wider die Obrigkeitshäiten mitainander fürgenommen oder Auffruer und emperung bewegen." In 1534 another question read: Have you any contact with the Anabaptists of Münster, and do you carry letters or messages from them? *Ibid.*, 8 recto.
118. Perneder, 25 recto.
119. *Ibid.*, 26 recto and verso.
120. Simon I, 200.
121. A copy from the ducal archives in *BHM Staatsverwaltung* 2778, 185.
122. All these in Perneder, 27 recto and verso.
123. *Ibid.*, 27 verso.
124. Perneder mentions some: 27 verso, 28 recto.
125. Vitus Anton Winter, *Geschichte der baierischen wiedertäufer im sechzehnten Jahrhundert* (Munich, 1809), 5-6.
126. Simon I, 201 ff.; Theobald, 182 ff.
127. Theobald, 174 ff.
128. Cf. entry in Aventinus' *Haus-Kalender* under 22 March 1528. Cf. note 1 above. On Zänkl see Gemeiner IV, 547.
129. *Haus-Kalender*, under August 1528.
130. In spite of careful administration, Wilhelm's personal finances were in desperate state at the end of his reign. See the documents in *BHM Fürstensachen* 322 and 352.
131. Winter, *Wiedertäufer*, v-vi.

SCHLEIERMACHER'S POLITICAL THOUGHT AND ACTIVITY, 1806-1813¹

R. C. RAACK, *Massachusetts Institute of Technology*

In the period of the Prussian reform movement, Friedrich Schleiermacher, pastor and intellectual, found a key political role in the Prussian state. Some aspects of Schleiermacher's singular public life during these years were considered by Wilhelm Dilthey in his short article on Schleiermacher's political thought and activity, written almost a hundred years ago.² But Dilthey never expanded this preliminary analysis which was, in any case, partial in coverage and limited in critical approach. The recovery of a vast body of material and information unavailable to Dilthey as well as greater historical perspective necessitate a thorough reconsideration of Schleiermacher's activities during these critical years.

The collapse of the Prussian state following the great defeats of Jena and Auerstadt in October, 1806, created the opportunity, previously absent in Prussia, for the first real participation by an informed public in the affairs of the state. With one blow Napoleon had rent the whole fabric of historical Prussia, had shattered its legends and had opened the political scene to critical and constructive public appraisal. Schleiermacher, then Professor and Pastor to the University in Halle, had a background of interest in public affairs which prepared him for the challenge occasioned by the sudden and utter defeats. Though his writing and lecturing before 1806 had largely been on non-political themes, a rather well-considered and consistent political philosophy can readily be derived from his earlier books and lecture notes. This was sufficiently developed by the time of the debacle to make later accretions, even those added during his active political life, merely refinements of an already clear pattern.³ Presumably his later propensity to formal political speculation was the result both of his involvement in politics and an increasing political awareness stimulated by his studies in the Greek classics.

Schleiermacher's political theories are actually a reasonable extension of his carefully evolved religious views. Recall that to Schleiermacher the single moment of religious intuition, and thus practically any single and unique religious experience, is the point of absolute validity in religion.⁴ This moment naturally belongs to the individual, but the course of religious development after the individual intuition is in the care of the religious community and finds its highest expression in the group. In similar fashion Schleiermacher establishes the

point on which must rest one important concern of any political philosophy—the relation of the individual and the group. Every individual is to Schleiermacher a distinct and precious materialization of the divine spirit.⁵ Each individual, however, can find completion, personal, moral and spiritual, only in a society.⁶ The same completion through the group exists for the individual in the political community and in all other aspects of human society: "the state is interlaced with the individuated intellect, free association in society caught together with art and religion. Because the individual and the general are really but one, each particular expression is inextricably and reciprocally interpenetrated with all other expressions: community and property, philosophy and religion, art and language."⁷ The nation-state, just like the religious community, is one single manifestation of the universe, a historical development from the natural familial relationship.⁸ Geography and language contribute to the further uniqueness of the individual people.⁹ As a result, each nation-state in its ideal form is a cultural and linguistic unity based on the group culture, a culture that impresses on each of its manifestations its own character. The ultimate goal is the formation by a people of its own separate nation. Until the completion of that end by each people, war must be regarded as inevitable and intervening periods of peace must be considered as transient.¹⁰

Recognizing that the state performs an essential function in every human society, Schleiermacher accorded it a major role. At the same time, his discouragement with the temper of his age as reflected in the decline of its political standards was often manifested in his early *Reden über die Religion* and *Monologen*. In the *Monologen* he lamented the failure of the state to maintain the ideal standard he found prefigured in the political hopes of the past. He chided those who saw the best state as that government which governed least: "Whoever thus regards the greatest achievement of human art, by which man should be raised to the highest level of which he is capable, as nothing but a necessary evil, as an indispensable method for covering up crime and mitigating its effects, must inevitably sense nothing but a limitation in that which is designed to enhance his life in the highest degree."¹¹ His complete rejection of the prevailing Enlightenment political philosophy compounded of mutual self-interest and eudaemonism was, in fact, implicit in all his political thought including his demand, uttered well before the actual rout of the Prussian armies by Napoleon in 1806, for a fundamental recasting of the political life of the nation.¹²

While Schleiermacher posited a massive role for the state in the life of the individual, he was often aware of the potential and actual antinomies between the two. He was particularly sensitive as well to the relationship between the two institutions of his community: state

and church. Because religion, of its very nature, was to Schleiermacher a tender and fragile moment of experience which could best be nourished by free intercourse between individuals who had possessed a common moment of religious intuition, the church, like the state, he imagined as a voluntary association of kindred spirits. It was, therefore, absolutely necessary that the connection between the state and the religious community not molest free religious expression. Schleiermacher was well aware that the relation he deemed necessary between the state and religious communities had not existed in the past.¹³

In summary, on the eve of the war between France and Prussia Schleiermacher had a sweeping conception of the function of the state and its place in the development of society. He based its entire rationale upon the necessity for the fullest development of the individual. With this principle was combined Schleiermacher's awareness of past and potential conflicts of interest between the individual and the political group. These convictions insured that his response to the crisis of 1806 would envisage the reconstruction of Prussia in terms primarily considerate of the individual and his fulfillment, and of the interrelation of the other community institutions with the state.

It would, however, be insufficient to examine Schleiermacher's activities during the period of the Prussian reform movement and the wars of liberation against France purely in terms of his abstruse philosophical formulations. His rationalized considerations were buttressed with a number of loyalties and attachments. Born a Prussian, he never wavered in his fundamental loyalty to his homeland. Most of the time he had no real reason to do so for, despite the stereotype, early nineteenth-century Prussia provided a hospitable climate for a figure of intellectual stature like Schleiermacher. Berlin, where he had spent many of his earlier years, prided itself as being "the Athens of the North." One foreign visitor termed it "the most enlightened city in Germany."¹⁴ And King Friedrich Wilhelm III, encouraged by the enlightened bureaucracy around him, had vague and half-formulated ideas of making his capital a center of free thought and of German art.¹⁵ In fact, the Prussian government, apparently desirous of caring for its intellectuals, had stayed Schleiermacher's reluctant decision to accept a professorship outside Prussia at Würzburg in 1804 in place of his rather isolated pastorate in Stolp in Prussian Pomerania with the offer of a chair and pulpit in Halle.¹⁶

The war threat in the fall of 1806 gave Schleiermacher his first opportunity to spell out his specific political concepts, the roots of which can be discerned in his earlier lectures and writings and in his loyalties to the Prussian state. As early as June of that year he wrote to his future sister-in-law, Charlotte von Kathen, that every individual must

throw himself into the inevitable war, for ". . . no individual can hope to save himself. Our whole life is rooted in and enhanced by German freedom and conviction." He foresaw slavery and ruin for the German people as the consequences of a defeat in the forthcoming battle. At stake were the German conscience, religion and the continued formation of the national spirit. Schleiermacher called upon the German people to rally to the cause, one which transcended the care of princes and their mercenary armies. "The crisis appears to me to be that of all Germany, and Germany is the kernel of Europe. . . I breathe desire for the tempest, anticipating from the coming storm the explosion."¹⁷

As the war threat alternately advanced and retreated during the summer of 1806, Schleiermacher's own conviction that a conflict was necessary remained firm. In late August he wrote to his publisher and friend, Georg Reimer, that regrettably it appeared that the crisis would pass without action. His fingers were itching to turn out a political pamphlet, he declared, and he longed to deliver a political talk.¹⁸ About the same time he delivered from his pulpit in Halle a sermon demanding an end to indifference toward public life and to the infection of cosmopolitanism. The state, Schleiermacher iterated in this moment of great peril to Prussia, is neither an artificial machine nor a necessary evil. Rather, it is an essential part of the life of the individual. He called upon the citizen to recognize his dependence upon the national group and, at least inferentially, to support it.¹⁹ Schleiermacher was fully cognizant of the political role he had undertaken through his pulpit.²⁰ Furthermore, in the second edition of his *Reden*, which he was preparing in Halle to be forwarded to Georg Reimer, he had newly interpolated in more than one spot references to the Napoleonic danger to Germany and particularly, as he imagined it, to Protestantism. Specifically, as a comparative perusal of the editions of the *Reden* reveals, Schleiermacher saw Napoleon as the instrument of a revived Catholic menace.²¹

The occupation of Halle by the French army almost immediately after the rout of the Prussians confronted Schleiermacher with the consequences of defeat. In the sack of the city he lost his quarters and some of his personal belongings.²² Somewhat more staggering for his personal equilibrium was the loss of his position, for Napoleon, after ordering the students to leave the city, closed the university.²³ Schleiermacher bitterly lamented the fate that had deprived him of the post in which he could successfully combine his predilections for philosophy, theology and the pulpit.²⁴ In spite of the "reign of Attila" (as he described the occupation of Halle²⁵), Schleiermacher was able to continue his patriotic strictures from the pulpit with apparent effect throughout the winter of 1806-1807.²⁶ But the institution of a prayer for the

King and Queen of Westphalia, to which Halle, detached from a Prussia dismembered by Napoleon, had been attached in the spring of 1807, led Schleiermacher to refuse to ascend the pulpit.²⁷

Long before 1806, Schleiermacher had identified the future of religion as he knew it with an undefined German spirit. In contrast, he associated the religion of Rome with a rigidity which he found antithetical to individuated religious experience.²⁸ The first edition of the *Reden* in 1799 had already prefigured the union of this German spirit with religion. In the edition of 1806 this identification was strengthened. Furthermore, he linked intellectual progress with Christianity and, even more specifically, with Protestantism.²⁹ Around the outbreak of the war Schleiermacher made even more precise the identification between the future of Protestantism with its independent spirit and the cause of Germany and especially of Prussia. In December, 1806, less than two months after Jena, he recalled to his friend and fellow pastor, Ehrenfried von Willich, the prophecy which he had made in the second edition of the *Reden*: "Napoleon hates Protestantism as he hates speculative thought." Should a time of persecution come, he wrote, "let us stand at our posts and fear nothing."³⁰ To Georg Reimer he wrote on a similar theme at the same time. He had hoped, he declared, that Napoleon would continue his conquest and subjection of North Germany with an assault on and persecution of Protestantism. On this basis Schleiermacher contemplated the beginning of a religious war "in the old German fashion." What he seems to have meant was some sort of mass outbreak of the German people which would call forth superficially obscured but essentially deep religious sentiments of the German people, as well as a fervent and deep-seated patriotic loyalty. In Protestantism, Schleiermacher repeated, reposed not only the strength of the North German spirit (*Sinn*) but also the fundamental verities of the German world of learning.³¹

Although the disaster of the Prussian state was complete, Schleiermacher lost neither his conviction that the Prussian cause was fundamentally good nor his belief that the future held the prospect of recovery. Again and again he returned to the theme so deeply rooted in the political theories which he had proposed in his sermon of the preceding August. The cause of the ruin of the Prussian state was its failure to grow beyond the level of mechanical organization. While Prussia had achieved an internal unity in learning and religion, the separation of the individual and the family and the group from the state had not been remedied. Without internal disunity, the worst mistakes and lack of talent could not have led to such a debacle. Yet he was certain that the blood and sacrifice of the war had not been in vain. He contemplated a revival coming out of the depths of the nation stir-

red, as he wrote to Reimer and Willich, by its unity in learning and religion. Additional hints of his own future political involvement can be seen in his criticism of the educated of the Prussian state for their separation from the masses. Often he reaffirmed his faith in the Prussian royal house. But he had no real ideal of how the regeneration of the Prussian state was to be brought about if Napoleon should fail to unleash the anticipated anti-Protestant crusade.³² After the detachment of Halle from Prussia in the spring of 1807, Schleiermacher's expressed loyalty to the Prussian state became ever stronger while, at the same time, he reemphasized the connection of Germany and the Protestant faith. Whatever the fate of Prussia, he wrote to his sister in the autumn of 1807, "I want, as long as I can, to seek the German fatherland where a Protestant can live and where Germans rule." His remarks concerning the religious strength of Prussia indicate that he had previously thought it to be the spiritual homeland of Protestant Germans.³³ It might be supposed, considering his juxtaposition of Protestantism and the progress of civilization, that he would naturally associate Prussia with Protestant cultural preeminence as well.

The important place of Berlin in the German intellectual world of the period tended to substantiate this notion of the cultural preeminence of Prussia. And it was to that city that Schleiermacher went in 1807 after deciding that his position in Halle was no longer tenable. It was natural that Schleiermacher should return to Berlin, where he had found so much satisfaction in earlier years. Despite the dreariness occasioned there by the French occupation and the economic difficulties which the loss of his position entailed, he found it possible to renew his old friendships and to take up once again both frequent guest sermons and private lecturing.³⁴ Furthermore, there Schleiermacher's place in Prussian university life might be restored. The king, stimulated by the petitions of two Halle professors who had visited him in Tilsit, decided to establish a higher educational institution in Berlin to replace that lost in Halle.³⁵ Schleiermacher was wholly in accord with this idea. His pamphlet, *Gelegentliche Gedanken über Universitäten im deutschen Sinne*, composed in 1808, expressed his hopes for the future of the new educational institution, his continued faith in Prussia and its cultural role, and his belief that Berlin, as the intellectual center of Prussia, was the proper place to establish a university.³⁶ This faith and these hopes were again closely connected with his belief that to Prussia belonged the spiritual leadership of Protestant North Germany.³⁷

Berlin did not immediately present the opportunities which had been offered by his influential position in Halle. Often Schleiermacher's despair over the destiny of defeated Prussia was joined to his lamentations over the uncertainty of his future.³⁸ He wished to become a "po-

litical person," although, as he wrote to his friend, Gustav von Brinckmann, he felt that he could do nothing for the regeneration "but preach." But he promised that, should he ever have the chance to do something else, he would fulfill the task assigned him.³⁹ Opportunities both in the pulpit and in the broader political world were presented him in the course of the same year. Access to the pulpit itself (he gave approximately eighteen sermons in the period from January through June, 1808, in various Berlin churches) offered to him an important forum in a city where no political meetings were allowed and where the newspapers were subject to the strictest censorship.⁴⁰

The winter and spring of 1807-1808 was a period of great decisions in Prussia. Baron Stein and the innovating bureaucrats of the Prussian government in exile were introducing the economic and political reforms that were to give their name to this period of Prussian history. Schleiermacher must have early become aware of the general outlines of the reform legislation. His approval and espousal of these efforts were expressed in the sermon which he gave in Berlin's old Dreifaltigkeitskirche on January 24, 1808, in commemoration of the birthday of Frederick the Great. In this sermon Schleiermacher went far beyond the simple patriotic appeal which had characterized his previous sermons, themselves not much removed from the traditional political sermon in Prussia.⁴¹ Schleiermacher recalled the respect for change in the Frederician spirit which made it possible for old Prussia to cast off obsolescent usages and to replace them with measures more in keeping with the exigencies of the times. In a contemporary analogy, he discussed the outmoded structure and vast inequality of the estates under the Prussian crown. A transformation of the old social order in a more egalitarian direction was one of the chief objectives of the group around Baron Stein. While Schleiermacher wisely based his appeal for progress on the basis of tradition, his effort from the pulpit was in substance revolutionary. It was the first of a series of such reform sermons which definitely aligned Schleiermacher and his influential pulpit with the reform party in the Prussian state on one of the first clear partisan political issues in its history.⁴² In keeping with his proposals for the replacement of the mechanistic tyranny of the state by a free community of citizens were those measures of the Stein government which conceded to the individual greater moral autonomy as a participant in the state-community. Schleiermacher was to take up the same reform theme again in support of the introduction of elected governments in the cities and the liberation of the church from state control—the latter an aspect of the reform movement in which he himself naturally had intense interest.⁴³

Schleiermacher's political sermons, his influential contacts in Ber-

lin and his desire to become a "political person" brought him into a secret conspiracy against Napoleonic domination in Germany. Apparently an attempt was to be made to bring Prussia, through an insurrection against Napoleon, into an alliance with Austria, which was known to be preparing to sponsor an uprising in all Germany. The whole scheme was encouraged by the success of the insurgents in Spain. For such a plot it was not difficult to find adherents. Prussia was overrun with discharged officers and soldiers and other uprooted patriots such as Schleiermacher himself. A similar group had formed the famous *Tugendbund* in Königsberg. In late August, 1808, Schleiermacher went to Königsberg on a mission for the Berlin conspirators, who had cloaked themselves with secret names (which, written in a notebook along with their real equivalents, Schleiermacher, in the naive manner of the nineteenth century, seems to have carried about with him). In the negotiations in progress between the Prussian government and Napoleon toward a final peace treaty, the Prussians faced the bleakest of terms. It was the wish of the Berlin patriotic group that the government might come to recognize its latent strengths and join the Austrians in a patriotic outburst against Napoleonic domination in Germany. These hopes were later undermined by the discovery by the French of Stein's own participation in anti-French activities and Napoleon's subsequently realized demand for Stein's removal from office. Nevertheless, Schleiermacher utilized the occasion of his visit in Königsberg to meet the leading military and civilian personalities of the Prussian government and to seek to win among them a following for his own ideas.⁴⁴ He preached once in the Schlosskirche, had an audience with Queen Louise and social contact with the crown prince and princess, as well as many conferences with the leading personalities of the Prussian government, including Baron Stein, whom he came to estimate very highly. His opinions on representation of the public in politics were solicited and Stein commissioned him to write a plan for the reorganization of the relation between state and church in Prussia.⁴⁵

Schleiermacher returned to Berlin at the end of September with his political faith much renewed. The contacts he had made in Königsberg and the commission he had been given gave him hope that he might ultimately realize some of his ideas with respect to the free association of church and state. His experiences had renewed his patriotic conviction and his belief in the destiny of the Prussian state. The Königsberg trip was, despite the failure of its original purpose, the beginning of Schleiermacher's influence in governmental affairs.

Although French pressure brought down the Stein government in November, it was replaced by another ministry to which Schleiermacher ascribed many hopes. Many of the officials in the new ministry,

which was headed by Karl Friedrich von Altenstein and Schleiermacher's old friend Count Alexander von Dohna, were the same re-reform-conscious administrators whom Schleiermacher had met in Königsberg. Dohna called upon Schleiermacher for direct political advice and ultimately, in July 1809, had him installed under Wilhelm von Humboldt in the Section for Public Instruction, where the plans for the new university in Berlin and other educational reforms, which Humboldt was advancing as rapidly as possible, were being formulated.⁴⁶

Yet Schleiermacher, despite his own personal successes: his new post in the government, his newly permanent pulpit as Reformed pastor in the Dreifaltigkeitskirche and his marriage in the spring of 1809, was soon very much aware that the political situation, in which he had placed so many hopes despite the fall of Stein, was rapidly worsening.⁴⁷ The ministry of Altenstein and Dohna, except for the section under Humboldt, was plainly unable to carry on with the work which had been begun by Stein and his associates. In addition, the Prussian state faced bankruptcy.⁴⁸ Schleiermacher's program for the reform of the church, *Vorschlag zu einer neuen Verfassung der protestantischen Kirche im Preussischen Staate*, which incorporated his ideas on the gradual unification of the two Protestant confessions and proposed the virtual independence of the church from the secular power, was far too revolutionary to suit the ideas of the head of the Section for Cults in the Prussian Ministry of the Interior, Ludwig Nicolovius.⁴⁹

Schleiermacher was deeply troubled by the dilatory course of the reform movement and, in addition, by the failure of the Prussian state to renew the struggle against the French. The Austrians had sounded the national call to the German people in the spring of 1809. He and the conspirators of the Berlin group, as well as many of those in high places in the Prussian government, had hoped that Prussia would join. Instead, Prussia remained an idle spectator while the Austrian-led German patriots were systematically eradicated by the French armies.⁵⁰ All the patriots must have shared Schleiermacher's despair, expressed in the late fall of 1809: "The hope of a suitable regeneration of our state, in which much has already begun, sinks ever further. . . . A sudden collapse is a good presumption."⁵¹

While Schleiermacher was merely discouraged with the course of the internal reform movement under the ministry of Altenstein and Dohna as well as the failure of Prussia to take up the German national cause, the ministry of Karl Friedrich Hardenberg, which succeeded that of Altenstein and Dohna in October, 1810, evoked from him a spirit of positive opposition. What particularly in the Hardenberg reforms offended Schleiermacher is difficult to determine. Hardenberg,

concerned with meeting the urgent financial problems of the Prussian state, concentrated his initial efforts upon increasing its revenues. First he secularized some of the lands belonging to the church. Subsequently he attempted to widen the tax base to include the nobility. It was probably not the secularization which annoyed Schleiermacher, for the income from those lands had long been diverted from its original purpose into the hands of high church and state officials.⁵² Certainly the effort to involve all the citizens in the tax base was a step in the direction of the equal participation and involvement of all the citizens in the state which Schleiermacher, it would seem, would have approved in principle. What appears to have displeased Schleiermacher (so much so that he wrote a letter to Stein and urged the latter to dissociate himself from the Hardenberg government which, he alleged, was posturing as a continuation of the Stein tradition) was the fact that the controversial fiscal nature of the Hardenberg program had set off a great battle among the estates within Prussia. The nobility, or a large portion of it, simply refused to surrender its privileges without a struggle. Curiously enough, it was the government's efforts which were, in Schleiermacher's eyes, undermining all hope of uniting the Prussians in a single cause. Hardenberg's reforms with their preeminent economic emphasis, reported Schleiermacher, demeaned the original good intentions of the reformers.⁵³ In any case, the reform note disappeared entirely from his sermons.⁵⁴

Nor could Schleiermacher appreciate Hardenberg's obvious indifference to the plans of the still active patriot group. With Stein in exile, the hopes of the patriots centered on patriotic generals such as Scharnhorst, Gneisenau and Boyen. Gneisenau in 1808 had made a plan for an uprising against the French, advocating the use of the Prussian clergy in its traditional role to awaken the public spirit.⁵⁵ No doubt Schleiermacher found such ideas quite acceptable. In 1811 Gneisenau, in a memoir submitted to the king, made a new and similar proposal to which Hardenberg, at least originally, was not hostile.⁵⁶ Gneisenau again proposed utilizing the pastors. Stein, from his place of exile, suggested Schleiermacher's name to Hardenberg as the most suitable man for arranging such a scheme.⁵⁷ The king, however, rejected Gneisenau's plan mockingly, noting that, "if one pastor should be shot, the affair would end." Shortly thereafter, both Scharnhorst and Gneisenau left Prussian service. The king made the alliance with the French which preceded the attack by Napoleon on Russia in June, 1812. In this alliance, Hardenberg willingly concurred.⁵⁸

The French alliance strained the very limits of Schleiermacher's political faith. The reform movement was directed down channels which he found unacceptable, while the proud Prussian eagle, to which

he had assigned preeminence in Germany, was shackled, however uncomfortably, to the *grande armée* in its drive to the east. Even the news of the retreat of the French and allied armies from Russia did not immediately revive his hopes. He wrote to his friend, Count Alexander von Dohna, as late as January 2, 1813, that the Prussian state, which he had felt had had a destiny in Germany and in Europe, had proved itself unworthy.⁵⁹ Yet in his sermon on the following day he alluded to the favorable situation which the defeat of the French might yield to Prussia. On December 28, 1812, the Prussian General Yorck had neutralized his corps and had refused for his own part to continue supporting the French. Schleiermacher had apparently learned of this neutralization from Gneisenau before his sermon. He proposed to his congregation that contracts made under duress need not be honored. Apparently this was not the first of his sermons of the period of the alliance with the French which had concerned itself with Prussia's status as a Napoleonic satellite. His activities in the church were already under the observation of one of Hardenberg's agents. Hardenberg, justifiably nervous with respect to the precarious status of Prussia, still under French occupation as well as allied to the vanquished, undoubtedly wished to see a stabilization of the situation before he determined with the king a proper policy for the state. Extraordinary efforts had been made to control public opinion in Prussia. Schleiermacher's discussion of the basic issue of the neutralization of Yorck's army before his congregation in a city where the news of Yorck's action was yet an official secret brought him further into disfavor.⁶⁰

The next few weeks were filled with the confusion attending the preparations by the Prussian government for a reversal of alliances. On January 23, the king's flight from Berlin to Breslau was made public. In early February, he asked for volunteers. To this summons Schleiermacher responded with an appeal to the young men of his congregation to heed the king's appeal to liberate the Fatherland, although the specific purpose of the king's call had not been announced.⁶¹ In late February the new alliance between Prussia and Russia was proclaimed. On March 20, the king issued an appeal to the patriotism of his subjects, followed in the next week by a summons to join the volunteer *Landwehr*. The request for volunteers was supported enthusiastically by Schleiermacher from the pulpit. The events of the foregoing two months portended to him the awakening of the national voice at last. The call for volunteers he considered the first step in the right direction toward a solution of the national question. The war should be fought, as he had noted in his reflections on the defeat of 1806, by the whole people and not by mercenary armies. By his action, the king was making the whole nation privy to the affairs of the nation at war, just as the Stein reforms had contemplated opening the path for the

recruitment of individual strengths toward the revival of the national community at peace.⁶²

Schleiermacher was not content to express his patriotism from the pulpit alone. He volunteered to serve as a chaplain with the Prussian army. Unsuccessful in that attempt, he enlisted in the *Landsturm*, a sort of national guard, which he saw as another means by which the Prussian state was capitalizing on the latent public strengths.⁶³ Yet he was dissatisfied with the cautious policy of Hardenberg and the refusal of the government to take the people into its confidence beyond the summoning of the two popular military groups. He condemned as well the failure of the common citizen to respond enthusiastically to the German cause.⁶⁴

But Schleiermacher's commitment to Prussia again carried him beyond these doubts. In a letter of June, 1813, to his old friend Friedrich Schlegel, he formulated his hopes for the future German state. Analyzed, they provide a weak buttress for the zeal and emotional intensity which he brought to his own political activities. He foresaw a German state united militarily and diplomatically, recognizing individual liberty and the special place of its traditional groups. His mistrust of the Catholic Habsburgs was manifest as well as his awareness of the difficulty of finding a subordinate position for Prussia in any Austrian-led German state. Beyond hopes for a continuation of the wartime cooperation between the two allies he would not go.⁶⁵ The exact method of attaining a German national state, and authoritarian Prussia's role in obtaining it—a cause to which Schleiermacher was already contributing all his strength—were at no time made precise. How were the vaguely formulated desires which he outlined to Schlegel connected with the heady patriotism of his daily activities? His own doubt about the conduct of the Prussian government and of the failure of the masses to respond suitably to what he thought was their own cause do not appear to have lessened his unshakeable faith and arduous efforts in favor of the goal he regarded himself to be supporting.

Yet Schleiermacher's ardent patriotism never went to the excesses of Francophobia reached by some of the patriots. Schleiermacher was too much aware of the great contribution of French culture to European society and of the enriching effect of the interpenetration of cultures. He condemned the exacerbation of national hatreds which was the main theme of so many of the patriotic manifestations of the period. Napoleon, not the French people, was Schleiermacher's enemy.⁶⁶

The desire for patriotic activity led Schleiermacher to the editorship of the *Preussischer Correspondent*, a newspaper founded as the voice of the Prussian state at war in June, 1813.⁶⁷ And it was Schleiermacher's term as editor that ultimately led to his disillusionment with

the Prussian cause. In July, 1813, the *Landsturm* was crippled by order of the king acting on the suggestion of frightened conservatives who saw in an armed public force a possible menace to internal stability. This was the first breach in the concept of the nation at arms which was so important to Schleiermacher's hopes for the revival of the nation. Only a few of those hopes had been realized. In the *Correspondent* he openly challenged the government's policy and attacked the motives behind the war effort which had permitted the then prevailing armistice with the French.⁶⁸ The government was outraged by Schleiermacher's provocative article. Some went so far as to demand that Schleiermacher be tried for high treason, although the issue was allowed to die with his resignation from the editorship.⁶⁹

This episode juxtaposed in Schleiermacher's mind, apparently for the first time, the Prussia of his ideals and hopes, and the narrowly circumscribed and manifestly authoritarian state of Hardenberg and Friedrich Wilhelm III. The doubts with respect to the conduct of the war and its relevance to his goals, which he had expressed as early as the spring and summer of 1813, were coalesced with a recognition of the realities of the Prussian state.⁷⁰ While he rejoiced at the great Allied victory at Leipzig in October, 1813, he felt that the energies engendered by the enthusiasm of the war period were being dissipated without regard for the future.⁷¹ In the succeeding winter his disenchantment was to become so complete that he was ready to give up Berlin and Prussia and the prominent position he held there as soon as tolerable employment could be found elsewhere.⁷²

With the rout and westward retreat of the French, all Germany was soon emptied of the former occupying armies. The conditions for the regeneration of Prussia, for which Schleiermacher had hoped since before the war of 1806, were at hand. They were not exploited. The Stein reform program, from which Schleiermacher had expected so much, was dormant. The political bases for a national movement in Germany were not essentially improved. Prussia was to be physically aggrandized but remained in basic character the pre-Jena state. The victory over the French had, in fact, apparently resanctified the existence of old Prussia and had removed the greatest stimuli toward change: the leaven of French revolutionary ideas which persisted still under Bonaparte and the necessity, born of defeat, for a basic reassessment of the old order in Prussia. The Protestant Church in Prussia was on the eve of its severest test, a new Byzantinism, which grew out of the failure of the reformers to diminish the vast arbitrary power of the Prussian crown. Against this effort to reorder the church by royal fiat Schleiermacher was to fight his greatest campaign in pulpit and pamph-

let. But his hopes for a free and independent religious community in a free state were eventually reduced to a mockery.

Schleiermacher himself had given the internal reform program little attention since he had come to disapprove of the methods of Hardenberg's reforms. He had, instead, focused his hopes on the regeneration of the Prussian nation and people through a mass patriotic outburst against French hegemony in Germany. Despite the evidences (which he had long recognized) that the effect for which he had hoped had not noticeably developed, he had dedicated all his energies to the war cause of the Prussian state. His qualms about Prussian policy were submerged in his ideals for the future of Germany. The victory over France brought neither the rewards which his heart had led him to expect from the great trial by battle nor did it bring nearer the social and political goals anticipated in his formal speculations.

The historian cannot demand from any figure a superhuman consistency. Between speculation and action there remain always the realities of performance. Certainly one consistency in Schleiermacher's political world was his attachment, sanctioned by his speculative thought, to the institutions to which he as a citizen belonged: the Protestant church and the Prussian crown. Coupled with this loyalty to the church and nation was Schleiermacher's identification of the interests of the Protestant faith in Germany with the cause of the Prussian state, and his correlation of the progress of German culture with Protestantism.

Yet in any overall assessment of Schleiermacher's political activities there must be recognized a serious hiatus between the ideal and the reality. Seizing the opportunity offered by his influential post, he entered the lists for the internal reforms under Stein, but he abandoned the same effort under Hardenberg for reasons which seem neither clear, consistent nor realistic. Furthermore, as the obstacles to the internal reform movement became increasingly serious, he equated more and more the achievement of his goals inside Prussia with attaining the national interests of the German people, even though he recognized that the Prussia which was pursuing the war was not far different from the nation he had condemned earlier. If it be extenuating rather than merely explanatory, let it be admitted that he made under pressure the same simple transfer of focus followed by most leading contemporaries. His example was but one of many in which the political liberalizer turned from the harder course of internal reform to the more immediately attainable panacea offered by the national cause. Nor was he alone in the Protestant intellectual world in willingly losing his reservations toward the Prussian authoritarian state out of his greater fear, real or imagined, of militant Catholicism. These two themes are

fundamental to an understanding of Schleiermacher's political activity and its relation to his political thought in these first few years of his public influence. Beyond Schleiermacher and his contemporaries they recur in the response repeatedly made in nineteenth-century German history by others who faced a similar task of resolving a difficult, seemingly insuperable, internal issue. These problems were often and easily effaced, at least temporarily, by seeking a general and all-embracing solution to the ever-present German national question.

1. This paper was presented before a session of the American Society of Church History in Washington, D.C., on 29 December 1958. Much of the research abroad was made possible by a grant from the American Philosophical Association (Penrose Fund).
2. Wilhelm Dilthey, "Schleiermachers politische Gesinnung und Wirksamkeit," *Preussische Jahrbücher*, X (1862), 234-277.
3. Günther Holstein, *Die Staatsphilosophie Schleiermachers* (Bonner Staatsgewissenschaftliche Untersuchungen, Heft 8, Bonn, 1923), 90.
4. Friedrich Schleiermacher, *Über die Religion, Reden an die Gebildeten unter ihren Verächtern* (first ed.) in Otto Braun and Johannes Bauer, eds., *Schleiermachers Werke*, IV (Leipzig, 1911), 245, 254.
5. *Reden über die Religion* (first ed.) 256, 265; Horace Deland Fries, ed. and trans., *Schleiermacher's Soliloquies* (Chicago, 1926), 31.
6. *Soliloquies*, 36; Friedrich Schleiermacher, *Brouillon zur Ethik*, in Otto Braun and Johannes Bauer, eds., *Schleiermachers Werke*, II (Leipzig, 1913), 93.
7. *Brouillon zur Ethik*, 103.
8. *Ibid.*, 95, 139-40.
9. *Ibid.*, 95, 100-1, 147, 166.
10. *Ibid.*, 147, 166-7.
11. *Soliloquies*, 58-9.
12. *Ibid.*, 51-3, 61-2; Friedrich Schleiermacher, *Grundlinien einer Kritik der bisherigen Sittenlehre*, in Otto Braun and Johannes Bauer, eds., *Schleiermachers Werke*, I (Leipzig, 1910), 237.
13. *Reden über die Religion* (first ed.), 334, 337-42; Friedrich Schleiermacher, *Die Lehre von Staat*, in Otto Braun and Johannes Bauer, eds., *Schleiermachers Werke*, III (Leipzig, 1911), 574; see also Friedrich Schleiermacher, *The Christian Faith* (translated from the second [1831] German edition by H. R. Mackintosh and J. S. Stewart, Edinburgh, 1928), 6, 28-9.
14. Quoted by Wilhelm Treue, "Adam Smith in Deutschland. Zum Problem des 'Politischen Professors' zwischen 1776 und 1810," in Walter Conze, ed., *Deutschland und Europa: Festschrift für Hans Rothfels* (Düsseldorf, 1951),
126. See also on Berlin, Wilhelm Dilthey, *Leben Schleiermachers*, I (second ed., Berlin, 1922), 218-229.
15. Max Lenz, *Geschichte der Königlichen Friedrich-Wilhelms Universität zu Berlin*, I, (Halle, 1910), 7-9.
16. Dilthey, *Leben Schleiermachers*, I, 697-711. See also the extracts from the letters written in the spring of 1804 from Schleiermacher to Heinrich Paulus in Würzburg, in Karl Ernst Heinrich (Berlin), *Autographen Katalog*, Versteigerung LXIII (1920).
17. Schleiermacher to Charlotte von Kather, 20 June 1806, Wilhelm Dilthey, *Aus Schleiermachers Leben in Briefen*, II (Berlin, 1858), 63.
18. S. to Georg Reimer, end of August, 1806, Schleiermacher Nachlass, Deutsche Akademie der Wissenschaften zu Berlin, Literatur-Archiv des Instituts für deutsche Sprache und Literatur; S. to Ehrenfried von Willich, 15 September 1806, Dilthey, *Briefe*, II, 67.
19. Johannes Bauer, *Schleiermacher als patriotischer Prediger: ein Beitrag zur Geschichte der nationalen Erhebung vor hundert Jahren* (Studien zur Geschichte des neuern Protestantismus, Heft 4, Giessen, 1908) 23; Friedrich Schleiermacher, "Wie sehr es die Würde des Menschen erhöht, wenn er mit ganzer Seele an der bürgerlichen Vereinigung hängt, der er angehört," *Sämtliche Werke*, Part II, Predigten, vol. I (new ed., Berlin, 1834), 223-38; Holstein, *Die Staatsphilosophie Schleiermachers*, 90-3.
20. S. to E. v. Willich, 15 September 1806, Dilthey, *Briefe*, II, 67.
21. This threat was later accounted for by Schleiermacher in the explanations to the third edition of the *Reden*: Friedrich Schleiermacher, *Über die Religion, Reden an die Gebildeten unter ihren Verächtern* (third ed., Berlin, 1821), 461.
22. S. to Heinrich Eichstädt, 9 December 1806, in J. A. Stargardt (Berlin), *Autographen Katalog* (1926), 53; S. to G. Reimer, 4 November 1806, Heinrich Meissner, *Schleiermacher als Mensch*, II (Sein Wirken, Briefe, 1804-1834, Gotha, 1923), 69-70; S. to Henriette Herz, 4 November 1806, Dilthey, *Briefe*, II, 71.

23. Dilthey, *Leben Schleiermachers*, I, 816-7.
24. *Ibid.*, 821.
25. S. to Eichstädt, 9 December 1806, Star-gardt, *Katalog* (1926), 53.
26. *Sämtliche Werke*, Part II, Vol. 1, 223-38; Reimer to S., 17 December 1806, Schleiermacher Nachlass; Adolph Müller, *Briefe von der Universität in die Heimat* (ed. by Ludmilla Assing, Leipzig, 1874), 359.
27. S. to Charlotte v. Kathen, 31 December 1807, Meisner, *Briefe*, II, 96.
28. *Reden über die Religion* (first ed.), 248.
29. *Ibid.*, 219-21; Friedrich Schleiermacher, *Über die Religion. Reden an die Gebil-detern unter ihren Verächtern* (second ed., Berlin, 1806), 364, 369, 371-2.
30. S. to E. v. Willrich, 1 December 1806, Meisner, *Briefe*, II, 78.
31. S. to Reimer, 20 December 1806, *Ibid.*, 83.
32. S. to G. Reimer, 6-8 December 1806, *ibid.*, 81; November 1806, *ibid.*, 72; S. to Charlotte v. Kathen, 1 December 1806, Dilthey, *Briefe*, II, 79; S. to G. Reimer, 4 November 1806, *ibid.*, 70-1; Friedrich Schlegel to S., 26 August 1807, *ibid.*, III (1862), 424.
33. S. to Charlotte v. Kathen, autumn 1807, Meisner, *Briefe*, II, 96; also, S. to Friedrich v. Raumer, 12 Jan. 1807, *ibid.*, 88; Dilthey, *Leben Schleiermachers*, I, 860.
34. *Ibid.*, 859; Scheiermacher Tagebuch, 1808, Schleiermacher Nachlass.
35. Franz Kade, *Schleiermachers Anteil an der Entwicklung des preussischen Bildungswesens von 1808-1818* (Leipzig, 1925), 109.
36. Friedrich Schleiermacher, *Gelegentliche Gedanken über Universitäten im deut-schen Sinne*, in Otto Braun and Johannes Bauer, eds., *Schleiermachers Werke*, IV (Leipzig, 1911), 623-5.
37. *Ibid.*, 642.
38. S. to Gustav v. Brinckmann, 1 March 1808, Schleiermacher Nachlass; S. to Charlotte v. Kathen, 10 April 1808, *ibid.*
39. S. to G. v. Brinckmann, 24 May 1808, Meisner, *Briefe*, II, 107.
40. Schleiermacher Tagebuch, 1808, Schleiermacher Nachlass; Walter Wendland, *Siebenhundert Jahre Kirchengeschichte Berlins* (Berlin, 1930), 190-1.
41. On the political sermon see Curt Horn, "Die patriotische Predigt zur Zeit Friedrichs des Grossen," *Jahrbuch für brandenburgische Kirchengeschichte*, XIX (1924), 78-92; see also, Wendland, *Siebenhundert Jahre Kirchengeschichte Berlins*, ch. VIII, *passim*.
42. Friedrich Schleiermacher, "Über die rechte Verehrung gegen das einhei-mische grosse aus einer fruheren Zeit," *Sämtliche Werke*, Part II, *Predigten*, Vol. I, 360-7.
43. See the sermon of January 1809, *Sämtliche Werke*, Part II, vol. IV, 1-13, and one from 1810, *ibid.*, 387-9. Schleiermacher's Tagebücher which exist for the years 1808, 1809 and 1810, indicate the extent of his activities in the pulpit. Most of the sermons them-selves are lost. See Bauer, *Schleiermacher als patriotischer Prediger*, 53.
44. For a key to at least one set of the pseudonyms see Schleiermacher Tagebuch, 1808, Schleiermacher Nachlass. See also, Dilthey, "Schleiermachers politische Gesinnung und Wirksamkeit," 270-1; and Meisner, *Briefe*, II, 382; S. to Reimer, 30 August 1808, Schleiermacher Nachlass; S. to Reimer, 6 September 1808, Meisner, *Briefe*, II, 110-1; Theodor von Schön, *Aus den Papieren des Ministers und Burggrafen von Marienburg Theodor von Schön*, I (Halle, 1875), 51.
45. Schleiermacher Tagebuch, 1808, Schleiermacher Nachlass; Schön, *Aus den Papieren Schön's*, IV (Halle, 1876), 566; S. to Brinckmann, 17 December 1809, Meisner, *Briefe*, II, 122; Franz Ruehl, ed., *Briefe und Aktenstücke zur Geschichte Preußens unter Friedrich Wilhelm III. vorzugsweise aus dem Nachlass von F. A. von Stägemann*, Ergänzungsband (Leipzig, 1904), 114.
46. Schleiermacher Tagebuch, 1808, Schleiermacher Nachlass; Gerhard Ritter, Stein, eine politische Biographie, I (Stuttgart, 1931), 455; Herman Mu-lert, ed., *Briefe Schleiermachers* (Ber-lin, 1923), 277; Kade, *Schleiermachers Anteil*... 111-2; Ruehl, *Stägemann Briefe*, Ergänzungsband, 160.
47. Schleiermacher Tagebuch, 1809, Schleiermacher Nachlass; S. to Charlotte v. Kathen, 3 August 1809, Meisner, *Briefe*, II, 1206; S. to G. v. Brinckmann, 17 December 1809, *ibid.*, 122.
48. Walter Simon, *The Failure of the Prus-sian Reform Movement* (Ithaca, N. Y., 1955), ch. III, *passim*.
49. Schleiermacher's *Vorschlag*... is printed by Erich Förster, *Die Entste-hung der preussischen Landeskirche unter der Regierung König Friedrich Wilhelms des Dritten nach den Quellen erzählt: Ein Beitrag zur Geschichte der Kirchenbildung im deutschen Protes-tantismus*, I (Tübingen, 1905), 160; see also, *ibid.*, 167; Fritz Fischer, *Lud-wig Nicolovius* (Stuttgart, 1939), 303; S. to G. v. Brinckmann, 17 December 1809, Meisner, *Briefe*, II, 122; Dilthey, *Briefe*, IV (1863), 173 f.n.
50. Friedrich Thimme, "Zu den Erhe-bungsplänen der Preussischen Patrioten im Sommer 1808. Ungedruckte Denkschriften Gneisenau's und Scharn-horst's," *Historische Zeitschrift*, LXXVI (1901), 78-9; Ritter, Stein, I, 426, II (Stuttgart, 1931), 47.
51. S. to G. v. Brinckmann, 17 December 1809, Meisner, *Briefe*, II, 122.

52. Simon, *Prussian Reform Movement*, 85; Walter Wendland, *Die Religiosität und die kirchenpolitischen Grundsätze Friedrich Wilhelms des Dritten* (Studien zur Geschichte des neuern Protestantismus, Heft 5, Giessen, 1909), 78.
53. S. to Stein, 1 July 1811, Meisner, *Briefe*, II, 135-6.
54. There is, unfortunately, only one sermon extant from the year 1811. Those from 1812 have no political references. See Bauer, *Schleiermacher als politischer Prediger*, 74-90.
55. Thimme, "Erhebungspläne," 78-9, 83-4; Ritter, *Stein*, II, 47-56, I, 426-7.
56. Franz Schnabel, *Deutsche Geschichte im neunzehnten Jahrhundert*, I (Freiburg-im-Br., 1929), 475; Fischer, *Nicolovius*, 363.
57. Erich Botzenhart, ed., *Freiherr vom Stein: Briefwechsel, Denkschriften und Aufzeichnungen*, III (Berlin, n.d.), 453.
58. Schnabel, *Deutsche Geschichte*, I, 475-6; Hans Delbrück, *Das Leben des Feldmarschalls Grafen Neidhardt von Gneisenau*, I (third ed., Berlin, 1908), 220-1.
59. S. to A. v. Dohna, 2 January 1813, Meisner, *Briefe*, II, 149.
60. Paul Czygan, *Zur Geschichte der Tagesliteratur während der Freiheitskriege*, I (Leipzig, 1911), 230.
61. So, at least, reported Hardenberg's agent, Czygan, I, 230; Bauer, *Schleiermacher als patriotischer Prediger*, 93.
62. Ruleman F. Eylert, *Charakterzüge und historische Fragmente aus dem Leben des Königs Friedrich Wilhelm III*, I (third ed., Magdeburg, 1843), 172-3, 175; Bauer, *Schleiermacher als patriotischer Prediger*, 93-5; S. to A. v. Dohna, 7 March 1813, Meisner, *Briefe*, II, 150-1; Hans Reuter, "Das innere Erleben des Krieges, verdeutlicht aus Schleiermachers Kriegspredigten," *Monatsschrift für Pastoraltheologie*, XIII Jahrg. (1917), 89. For the earlier references see S. to Charlotte v. Kathen, 20 June 1806, Meisner, *Briefe*, II, 64.
63. S. to A. v. Dohna, 17 April 1813, *ibid.*, 153; S. to his wife, 14 May 1813, *ibid.*, 157.
64. S. to Hermann v. Boyen, 13 [May 1813?], Stargardt, *Autographen Katalog* (1926), 30; S. to his wife, 30 May 1813, Meisner, *Briefe*, II, 178.
65. S. to Friedrich Schlegel, 12 June 1813, *ibid.*, II, 189-90.
66. *Die Lehre vom Staat*, 589; Hermann Dreyhaus, "Der Preussische Correspondent von 1813/14 und der Anteil seiner Gründer Niebuhr und Schleiermacher," *Forschungen zur brandenburgischen und preussischen Geschichte*, XXII (1909), 428.
67. Scharnhorst to S., 8 March 1813, Mülert, *Briefe*, 300. On the *Preussischer Correspondent*, see Dreyhaus, "Der Preussische Correspondent . . . , " *passim*.
68. S. to G. Reimer, 24 July 1813, Meisner, *Briefe*, II, 204; Dreyhaus, "Der Preussische Correspondent . . . , " 427.
69. S. to G. Reimer, 24 July 1813, Meisner, *Briefe*, II, 204; Dreyhaus, "Der Preussische Correspondent . . . , " 433-41.
70. S. to Gräfin v. Voss, 3 July 1813, Meisner, *Briefe*, II, 201.
71. S. to G. Reimer, 14 November 1813, *ibid.*, 205.
72. S. to G. Reimer, 14 November 1813, *ibid.*, 205; S. to J. Eichhorn, 8 November 1813, 13 December 1813, former Preuss. Geh. Staatsarchiv; now Deutsches Zentralarchiv, Abt. Merseburg, Rep. 92, Eichhorn Nr. 53, Bl. 6-9; W. C. Müller to S., 30 April 1814, Schleiermacher Nachlass.

METHODIST HISTORICAL STUDIES 1930-1959*

FREDERICK A. NORWOOD

Following a period of neglect Methodist historiography in the three decades since 1930 has taken a new start. The keynote of this revived interest is not antiquarian but existential, and manifests a concern for the recovery of the Methodist heritage as roots for the faith of the present. Curiously, this interest in the denominational background arises in part from increasing participation in the Ecumenical Movement. Methodists have felt that they had something of their own to offer, but were not quite sure what it was.

Much excellent historical research, of course, preceded the work of these more recent decades. All serious Wesley studies are based on the fundamental research of men like Richard Green, Thomas Jackson, Nehemiah Curnock, John Telford, George Osborn, and Edward Sugden. The American form of denominational history established by Jesse Lee was carried on by Nathan Bangs and Abel Stevens, and later by J. M. Buckley and John F. Hurst. The most important development in the direction of modern American historical scholarship is associated with the name of William Warren Sweet, who gave a new turn to the whole field of American church history. The first edition of his *Methodism in American History* appeared in 1933.

The study of Methodist history has been affected by certain continuing peculiarities. In the first place a serious gap has existed between English and American scholarship. Each has tended to go its own way, owing in large part to the historical separation of English and American Methodism. The World Methodist Council has overcome this gap only to a limited degree. Awareness of the heritage has been more continuous and direct in England than in America. Perhaps the best illustration is the Wesley Historical Society of English Methodism, which has maintained in publication its *Proceedings* since 1893, and still has a series of historical lectures which are published. By way of contrast, American Methodism has had no historical journal at all. Organization for study has been until recently centered around the historical societies of annual conferences, which are united in the Association of Methodist Historical Societies. Since 1955 an informal group known as the Wesley Society has been fostered on a regional basis, composed of individuals who have shown an interest in the Wesleyan heritage of Methodism. In general, however, research culminating in

*Excluded from this survey are the following categories: purely local history, M. A. theses, promotional materials, studies of chiefly contemporary relevance. It is hoped that a supplementary note will cover Scandinavian research.

publication has been carried on by individuals. A special genre of material has appeared more frequently in recent years in the form of doctoral dissertations.

For these reasons the difference in the atmosphere of historical scholarship then and now is more apparent in America than in England. The continuity of study and interest has been more regular in Wesley's homeland. There historiography has not been tied in with the structure of annual conferences. There a society of long duration, possessed of a regular historical journal, has helped promote and unify the studies.

Nevertheless, on both sides of the Atlantic the last three decades mark a clearly delineated period in the study of Methodist history. In the 1930's appeared a notable series of publications of the sources on John Wesley—the *Journal*, the *Letters*, the *Standard Sermons*—either in new or anniversary edition. In 1958 came at long last the new edition of the *Journal and Letters of Francis Asbury*. In the area of biography 1934 saw the last volume of John Simon's monumental study of John Wesley and the Societies; while in 1958 was translated the finest new study of Wesley, that published in German in 1953 by Martin L. Schmidt. In the field of social influences the period is marked by Wellman Warner's *The Wesleyan Movement in the Industrial Revolution*, 1930, and the most recent in the series of economic studies by Robert Wearmouth, 1957. The ferment at work in the reassessment of Wesley's theology is illustrated by the publications of George Croft Cell (1935) and Umphrey Lee (1936) and the several works of the 1950's, notably Franz Hildebrandt's *From Luther to Wesley*, 1951. The numerous doctoral dissertations of the 1940's and 1950's should also be mentioned here. In American Methodism the period is marked by Sweet's textbook and source studies and by the recent works of men like Leland Scott and John Peters. In Methodist world missions the field is dominated by the monumental unfinished *History of Methodist Missions* by Wade Barclay, volume three of which came out in 1957. During the period under consideration more than three hundred titles in all areas have appeared.

That the new blood of historical scholarship is beginning to spread more widely in Methodist consciousness is indicated by the increasing space devoted to these topics in the denominational publications. *Together*, following a precedent set in the old *Christian Advocate*, is devoting an entire double issue in November, 1959, to the 175th anniversary of the beginning of organized American Methodism in 1784. And the magazine for pastors, *The New Christian Advocate*, continues to give attention to the Methodist heritage as related to the work of the church, although the late *Pastor* was better at this point. *Religion in Life*, the nondenominational scholarly journal of Methodist sponsorship, has

since 1950 carried regularly considerably more articles on Methodist history than formerly.

I. GENERAL: METHODISM IN PROTESTANT LITERATURE

Although this article cannot presume to cover the publications in which Methodism figures in part either directly or indirectly, a few titles are of outstanding value for background. Of these one of the most general and one of the best is Basil Willey, *The Eighteenth Century Background*,¹ which is a sequel to his book on the seventeenth century background. His theme is the idea of nature as a key to the century, and the persons dealt with range from Shaftesbury and Butler to Burke and Wordsworth.

Particular doctrines that have special bearing on Methodism are studied carefully in R. Newton Flew, *The Idea of Perfection in Christian Theology*,² which has chapters on Pietism, Law, and Methodism, and Ronald Knox, *Enthusiasm*,³ an outspoken book by an able Roman Catholic scholar who has spent some thirty years studying a topic which he regards as a sort of fulfillment of Bishop Bossuet's *History of the Variations*. Although he covers the whole course of Christian history, his emphasis falls on the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries. In this book Wesley appears, "leaping to infallible conclusions," "a cheerful experimentalist who in all the hesitations of a lifetime never asked himself by what right he ruled," with the mind of a Jesuit and the morals of a Jansenist. The book, which is as good a source on Knox as it is on Wesley, must be used with care. A more direct source of information is the book edited by J. M. Creed, *Religious Thought in the Eighteenth Century*,⁴ which contains selected passages from works, chiefly English, of Locke and the Deists, Law, Butler, Wesley, and Kant. The weakness is that common to all such collections, failure to present adequately thinkers whose writings rely on sustained continuity of thought. Dealing with the Arian and Deistic controversies and Arminianism is Roland Stromberg, *Religious Liberalism in Eighteenth-Century England*.⁵ The background in church-state relations is best seen in Norman Sykes, *Church and State in England in the Eighteenth Century*.⁶

More directly related to the Evangelical Revival are the able works of Marcus Loane, *Oxford and the Evangelical Succession* and *Cambridge and the Evangelical Succession*,⁷ and Elliott-Binns, *The Early Evangelicals*.⁸ The latter is well documented and goes into considerable regional detail.

Another background book that ought to be mentioned in any survey of Methodist history deals with the Continental movement of

Pietism: Koppel S. Pinson, *Pietism as a Factor in the Rise of German Nationalism.*⁹

In recent years several interpretive studies in the field of American church history have had an important bearing on the situation in which American Methodism developed. Among these are the following: Winthrop Hudson, *The Great Tradition of the American Churches*,¹⁰ which shows the influence of voluntarism in American Protestantism; Ronald Osborn, *The Spirit of American Christianity*¹¹; C. Howard Hopkins, *The Rise of the Social Gospel in American Protestantism*¹²; and Timothy Smith, *Revivalism and Social Reform in Mid-Nineteenth Century America.*¹³ The last reinterprets the roots of the social gospel, and maintains the thesis that revivalism played a large part in the development of a social consciousness, especially of "equalitarian, perfectionist optimism." Although one might question whether the connections were so direct as he suggests, certainly we have in this book a valuable reassessment of nineteenth-century American Protestantism. He argues that the center was in the cities rather than in the rural West.

II. ENGLISH METHODISM

No major work has been done in bibliographical studies, either in English or American fields. A. W. Harrison wrote on "Fifty Years of Studies in Methodist History" in the *Proceedings of the Wesley Historical Society* (hereafter WHS Proc.).¹⁴ Edward Fortney brought out a short survey, "The Literature of the History of Methodism," in *Religion in Life* (hereafter RnL) in 1955.¹⁵ Otherwise the main sources of reference lie in the bibliographies, some of them exhaustive, attached to major studies. Among these one might mention the following: *The Journal and Letters of Wesley*; *the Journal and Letters of Asbury*; *Barclay's History of Methodist Missions*, etc.

A. Primary Sources

The standard edition of Wesley's *Journal* was prepared by Nehemiah Curnock (the last two volumes finished by John Telford) between 1909 and 1916. In 1938 this fine edition came out in a new format in honor of the bicentennial of Wesley's conversion at Aldersgate.¹⁶ A reprint of Curnock's abridgment was published in 1951.¹⁷ The companion to the *Journal* is the standard *Letters*, edited in 1931 by John Telford.¹⁸ Both of these editions provide full and scholarly apparatus for study and interpretation. A feature of the *Journal* is a long introduction in which the story of the famous diaries is told. *Selected Letters*, edited by Frederick Gill, brings together 244 pages of some of the most interesting.¹⁹ Two volumes of *Standard Sermons*, edited by Edward Sugden,²⁰ round out the modern editions of Wesley's

works. These comprise the official forty-four sermons, plus nine others of special influence. The second edition of 1935 is based on the first of 1921. For the rest the scholar is forced back to the *Works*, edited in fourteen volumes by Thomas Jackson or in seven volumes by John Emory. These are essentially the same, except for certain rearrangements of tracts. They are still indispensable for reference to Wesley's many tracts and the sermons not included in the *Standard Sermons*, but the editing leaves much to be desired. A reprint of the *Works* is available now.²¹

Two books successfully attempt to gather together in small compass some of the best of Wesley and early Methodism. The most comprehensive is *The Rise of Methodism*, edited by Richard Cameron,²² composed of substantial selections from the writings of John and Charles, together with those of George Whitefield and other early leaders, and arranged according to topics dealing with polity and organization. The other is an excellent *Compend of Wesley's Theology*, edited by Robert Burtner and Robert Chiles.²³ It covers, after the manner of compends, with selections from the works of Wesley, the topics of religious knowledge, the Persons of the Trinity, man, salvation, ethics, church, and eschatology. Various selections from the hymns of John and Charles Wesley are noted below.

B. General Treatments

Many historical and biographical studies have appeared that offer different interpretations. A few works are purely interpretive. Chief among these in recent years is Henry Carter, *The Methodist Heritage*,²⁴ being the distilled wisdom of one of the distinguished British Methodist leaders. The author seeks to find points of contact between Methodism and the Ecumenical Movement. In an article in the *London Quarterly and Holborn Review*²⁵ (hereafter *LQHR*) E. Gordon Rupp deals with the questions, What were we? and What have we become? John Kent in "M. Elie Halévy on Methodism"²⁶ questions the reliability of the noted French author's famous conclusions on Methodist social influence in England. Another French approach to Wesley is to be found in the *Revue des Deux Mondes* where A. de la Gorce writes on "Wesley, réformateur de l'Angleterre."²⁷ A Norwegian judgment is A. Kristofferson, *Metodismens Vesen*,²⁸ which the reviewer has not seen. In the *Journal of Religion* Francis J. McConnell reflects "New Interest in John Wesley."²⁹ An excellent symposium edited by W. K. Anderson is *Methodism*.³⁰

In view of the large amount of specialized research during the

three-decade period, it is surprising to discover so few comprehensive histories. The only book that attempts—and attempts with wit and verve—to cover the whole history on both sides of the Atlantic is the tried, and in general true, *Story of Methodism* by Halford Luccock, Paul Hutchinson, and Robert Goodloe.³¹ Unfortunately it is rather superficial and adds nothing to scholarship. This work has gone through many printings, and in 1949 was brought down to date with an added chapter. An interesting picture book of British and American Methodism is *An Album of Methodist History*, edited by Elmer Clark.³² A new definitive history of British Methodism, under the general editorship of E. Gordon Rupp, is in preparation. Three volumes will cover the periods (1) to the death of Wesley, (2) 1791-1850, (3) 1850-1950; and a fourth will contain documents. This will be matched by a new history of American Methodism, noted below.

C. Wesley Biography

As might be expected, a major share of the publication has had to do with the life of the founder. John Simon finally brought to completion his magnificent life and times study in five volumes, begun in the 1920's, with *John Wesley, the Last Phase*, in 1934.³³ This work, based on the earlier and still excellent studies of men like Luke Tyerman, but still more on an exhaustive analysis of the sources, will remain a standard resource for a long time. It is more than a life story of Wesley. It expresses rather the view that the man can scarcely be seen apart from his work—the Societies. Of the several efforts to deal more directly with the person, the most successful and most important is *John Wesley* by Martin Schmidt,³⁴ published in German in 1953. This first volume of two carries the story to 1738. The author, who is professor of church history in the Kirchlichen Hochschule in Berlin, calls upon a long study of Wesley dating from his doctoral dissertation in 1938 to set forth a most stimulating interpretation of the influences bearing on the young Wesley. He carefully investigates Wesley's understanding of Pietism, especially as it affected Wesley's understanding of Luther. His conclusion is that the latter was *not* basically distorted by the former. In his view the earlier spiritual experiences were preparatory to the truly decisive episode of Aldersgate. Schmidt's two volumes are now available in German and in English translation.

In many ways the most satisfactory biography in English is that by C. E. Vulliamy, *John Wesley*.³⁵ This judgment is quite relative, because the book is in no way definitive. In fact, the definitive one volume biography of Wesley has not yet been written. One of the most popular and widely read is the well written but not profound *The Lord's Horseman* by Umphrey Lee, reprinted in 1954 from the first edition

of 1932.³⁶ A magnificent *tour de force* that excitingly combines the personalities of author and subject is Francis J. McConnell's *John Wesley*.³⁷ The only trouble is that sometimes McConnell is more easily discerned than Wesley. Nevertheless, this study of interpretation—it is that rather than biography—is to be valued for its incisive criticism of previous work. It tends to emphasize the negative side of the issue of sanctification as a source of conflict rather than the positive side as a force for power and growth.

The well-rounded and broadly based investigation by the Belgian Franciscan scholar, Maximin Piette, *La réaction wesléenne dans l'évolution protestante*, translated as *John Wesley in the Evolution of Protestantism*,³⁸ originally published in Brussels in 1925 but available to English readers only after 1937, is interesting as a sympathetic view by a Roman Catholic. He develops his interpretation from that of the earlier Leger (1910), emphasizes the Oxford episodes of 1725 rather than the Aldersgate experience of 1738 (that is, sanctification rather than justification). Thus he is able to see Wesley in the categories of Catholic holiness rather than Protestant grace. The whole is cast in the large frame of historic Reformed Protestantism. Another interesting and altogether different Roman Catholic treatment is the recent book by John M. Todd, a loyal but lay writer, *John Wesley and the Catholic Church*.³⁹ He tries manfully to make his hero follow the mystical way of St. John of the Cross toward what he regards (privately) as veritable sainthood. Of lighter stuff but nevertheless valuable and honest, is G. Elsie Harrison, *Son to Susanna; The Private Life of John Wesley*.⁴⁰ Although the work is not annotated, it is not sensational in its development of the thesis of mother fixation. Popular and not original are Richard Pyke, *John Wesley Came This Way*,⁴¹ and Leslie Church, *Knight of the Burning Heart*.⁴² A type of duobiography—compare Somervell on Disraeli and Gladstone—is Mabel Brailsford, *A Tale of Two Brothers*.⁴³ This book really belongs with biographical treatments of Charles Wesley, for the author's interest is to present him and distinguish him from his more famous brother. The background of the gradually developing break between them is fully covered. The wider *Family Circle* is described by Maldwyn Edwards.⁴⁴

D. Wesley—Special Aspects

A large number of books and articles on sundry aspects of Wesley's life have appeared. The *Wesleys at Oxford* is the theme of P. F. Douglass.⁴⁵ One that goes into the background of his family is William

Crook, *The Ancestry of the Wesleys*.⁴⁶ "The Human Side of John Wesley" is set forth in *RnL* by Frederick Maser.⁴⁷ A delightful, if not altogether convincing, attempt to build a spiritual relationship between Wesley and his followers and St. Francis and his companions is made in "The Little Flowers of John Wesley," by Richard Cameron in the same journal.⁴⁸ Dealing with the early episode of Georgia is an article in the same place by Frederick Maser.⁴⁹ On the major period of his conversion in 1738 is the larger part of the issue of *LQHR* for 1938, comprising sixteen articles.⁵⁰ On the same subject in the same year is *The Conversion of the Wesleys* by J. Ernest Rattenbury, one of England's outstanding scholars.⁵¹ Although the book is short, much valuable insight is presented to show that 1738 was a crucial year and May 24 an epoch-making day. He looks at these essentially Protestant experiences in the light of Roman, humanist, and psychological insights. But they were, he argues, Protestant properly only in the context of catholic Anglicanism. John McNeill has dealt with one angle in "Luther at Aldersgate" in *LQHR*.⁵² Relations between Wesley and his preachers are discussed in William Doughty, *John Wesley, His Conferences and His Preachers*,⁵³ and Douglas Chandler, "John Wesley and His Preachers."⁵⁴ The preacher himself is the subject of *John Wesley, Preacher*,⁵⁵ which is concerned more with homiletics than theology, and John Bishop, "John Wesley as a Preacher."⁵⁶ Both the above articles appeared in *RnL*. Wesley as pastor rather than preacher is portrayed in Johannes Schempp, *Seelsorge und Seelenführung bei John Wesley*.⁵⁷ Some evidence that Wesley travelled is offered in a number of works, among which are the following: Thomas Hulme, *Voices of the New Room*,⁵⁸ a popular lecture on episodes connected with the ministry in Bristol; Robert Haire, *Wesley's One-and-Twenty Visits to Ireland*,⁵⁹ a popular book intended chiefly for youth; John Bowmer, "John Wesley and Ireland,"⁶⁰ in two parts in *LQHR*; Wesley F. Swift, *Methodism in Scotland*,⁶¹ a Wesley Historical Society lecture planned to fill in a gap neglected by other works; Griffith Roberts, "Wesley's First Society in Wales,"⁶² one of many investigations into local history in *WHSProc*; H. M. Brown, "Rise of Methodism in Cornwall"⁶³; F. F. Bretherton, "Wesley's Visits to Holland" in *WHSProc*.⁶⁴ These *Proceedings* offer a rich mine of scattered and generally brief articles on many aspects of local history in the British Isles, especially Bristol, Birmingham, Anglesey, and Cornwall.

Other studies present Wesley in relation to various contemporaries. Two excellent books are Eric Baker, *A Herald of the Evangelical Revival*,⁶⁵ and J. B. Green, *John Wesley and William Law*.⁶⁶ Baker deals with Wesley's debt to Law, his differences from Law, and Methodism's debt to Law. Green is in the same area and makes men-

tion of the work of Baker, which was done before but published after Green. The latter centers more on the theological aspects and on the two men while Baker is broader and includes background and Methodism as a whole. F. E. Hutchinson writes on "John Wesley and George Herbert" in *LQHR*,⁶⁷ and in the same journal are found G. D. Henderson, "A Scottish Teacher of the Wesleys" (Henry Scougal),⁶⁸ Harry Belshaw, "The Influence of John Wesley on Dr. Johnson's Religion,"⁶⁹ H. Trevor Hughes, "Jeremy Taylor and John Wesley,"⁷⁰ Frank Baker, "Jonathan Swift and the Wesleys,"⁷¹ and W. L. Doughty, "Thomas Fuller and the Wesleys."⁷² Some of these, of course, deal with literary, others with personal relations.

The literary Wesley is the subject of the little book by G. H. Valins, *The Wesleys and the English Language*,⁷³ which looks into the little known *Grammar* and *Dictionary*. Articles in *LQHR* on Wesley and books are George Jackson, "John Wesley as a Bookman,"⁷⁴ and Frank Baker, "A Study of John Wesley's Readings."⁷⁵ George Lawton has "Proverbs and Proverbial Echoes in John Wesley's Letters" and other articles with similar titles in various issues of *WHSProc.*,⁷⁶ and J. B. Ewens writes on "Henry Carey, John Wesley, and 'Namby-Pamby,'" in *LQHR*,⁷⁷ with more on the poet than on Wesley. William Arnett has a dissertation on Wesley's use of the Bible.⁷⁸

John Wesley Among the Physicians by A. Wesley Hill opens the field of his scientific interests.⁷⁹ This medical study concludes that he was by no means an amateur in his concern about hygiene, preventive treatment, electrical methods, and psychological influences. Another more general investigation of the same field is R. E. Schofield in *Isis*: "John Wesley and Science in Eighteenth Century England."⁸⁰

E. Wesley—Theology

One of the most fertile areas of Wesleyan historical study is that of theological reinterpretation. Indeed, some of the most significant books of the three-decade period belong in this area. The 1930's brought forth enough incisive contributions to provide incentive for research down to the present. Two of the most important, worth mentioning together because they present Wesley in different lights, are G. Croft Cell, *The Rediscovery of John Wesley*,⁸¹ which was published in 1935, and Umphrey Lee, *John Wesley and Modern Religion*,⁸² which followed the next year. Cell sought to demonstrate the theocentricity of Wesley in the sense that the objective elements of the Christian life appear more central than the subjective as seen in direct personal religious experience. Faith is something given, not felt. Cell also tried to show how Wesley reacted against the humanistic variety of Arminian-

ism of his times, and accepted Calvinism in its broad significance without succumbing to the special doctrines surrounding predestination. The "evangelical" 1738 was more important than the "catholic" 1725. Wesley followed Luther in the prime doctrines of justification by faith and the authority of Scripture, but he did not follow him blindly. In this work Cell made his famous statement of Wesleyanism as "an original and unique synthesis of the Protestant ethic of grace with the Catholic ethic of holiness."

Lee, while accepting the influence of Reformed Protestantism on Wesley, emphasized his dependence on the rational trends of the Enlightenment. The idea that Wesley revolted against these trends is only half true. If Pietism turned him against the deadly rationalism of Deism, he was equally influenced by the powerful forces of reason, including science. The unique thing was a "combination of mystical experience with the ethical, the rational, and the institutional elements of religion." The conversion of 1738 was rather the conversion of one who was already a Christian to a higher state of commitment. The guiding influence throughout was high-church Anglicanism, not Calvinism. Both Lee and Cell took account of Wesley's doctrine of prevenient grace, but neither could be said to have had the last word. Wesley was against extreme Calvinism, and he was against humanistic Arminianism. Lee tried to protect him against the former, Cell against the latter. Lee had already written one of the Columbia University Studies, *The Historical Backgrounds of Early Methodist Enthusiasm*,⁸³ which dealt mainly with seventeenth century foundations.

One year after Lee's major book appeared *The Spirit of Methodism* by Henry Bett.⁸⁴ This book is not so definitive as the others but is significant for its presentation of Wesley as friendly to mysticism. The problem of Wesley and mysticism is similar to that of Luther. Both men were influenced by it as they both denounced it. Bett's interpretation agrees with many earlier studies that placed large emphasis on the element of religious experience. Bett suggests that in this Wesley anticipated Schleiermacher—and in this suggestion may have misinterpreted both men.

A more recent survey of Wesley's theology, which is not so much survey as special investigation of his doctrine of justification, is *The Theology of John Wesley* by William R. Cannon.⁸⁵ The emphasis of this work falls much more on justification than on sanctification. Wesley's doctrine of grace is stretched to permit the cooperation of men, to a degree, with God in the work of salvation. Another scholar whose books of the 1940's made a contribution toward the understanding of Wesleyan theology was J. Ernest Rattenbury of England. His *The Evangelical Doctrines of Charles Wesley's Hymns*,⁸⁶ and *The Eucharis-*

tic Hymns of John and Charles Wesley,⁸⁷ rejected the position of J. H. Rigg and others that Wesley changed in 1738 from High Churchman to evangelical preacher, and argued that, through his continued devotion to sacramental faith, he remained in the high Anglican line. He concluded that Wesley was "a moderate High Churchman, though unquestionably irregular." His emphasis is illustrated by his point that Wesley did not believe that a bishop was only a presbyter, but rather that a presbyter was really a bishop. In the first of the books referred to above the author discusses the theological content of the hymns under the headings of "Hymns of the Hinterland" (basic Christian theology), and "Hymns of the Pilgrim Way" (special Wesleyan emphases). In the other book he takes up the influence of Brevint's *The Christian Sacrament and Sacrifice*. His conclusion is that the Wesleyan doctrine of the Lord's Supper is not Roman but is realistic, stands in the context of the priesthood of all believers, and is adaptable to the Ecumenical Movement. Another work dealing with doctrines through hymns is that by R. Newton Flew: *The Hymns of Charles Wesley*.⁸⁸ In this "lecture" Flew seeks to apply the hymns to the theological needs of a "converted old boozer." He gives one or two examples in each chapter. One of the newer general theological interpretations is the published form of the Rall Lectures of Garrett Biblical Institute, *Christianity According to the Wesleys* by Franz Hildebrandt,⁸⁹ who finds it Scriptural, Practical, Missionary, Catholic. An approach to Wesley's theology from the viewpoint of the Ecumenical Movement is ably presented in the dissertation of Colin Williams, "Methodism and the Ecumenical Movement."⁹⁰ This work of basic reassessment, which is scheduled for publication by Abingdon Press under the tentative title, *The Heritage of Methodism*, seeks to find those elements of Wesley's thought which may be most creatively related to the Ecumenical Movement.

Recently the author's attention has been called to a series of documented studies in historical theology published by the Christliche Vereinsbuchhandlung in Zürich, under the general title *Methodismus in Dokumenten*.⁹¹ These deal with topics such as the Church, Christian experience, preaching, and the appointment system. The most recent, and most exciting, theological enterprise is the first Institute of Methodist Theological Studies, held at Oxford in July, 1958, and reported in the July, 1959, issue of *LQHR*.⁹² E. Anker Nilsen on prevenient grace, Rupert Davies on "The People of God," Franz Hildebrandt on distinctive emphases, William Strawson on Last Things, and David Shipley on nineteenth century American theology, are most directly related to this survey. Unfortunately not all of the excellent papers could be printed in the periodical.

A large number of specialized studies have elucidated various aspects of Wesley's thought. One might begin with an article by Frank Baker on the influence of the *Imitation of Christ* in *LQHR*.⁹³ This leads to Faulkner's "Wesley the Mystic" in the old *London Quarterly Review*.⁹⁴ A more ambitious attempt to relate Wesley to Luther is the book by Franz Hildebrandt entitled *From Luther to Wesley*,⁹⁵ which includes not only the obvious direct connections but also the more subtle theological influences and independent similarities. Another study bringing the same two men together is the dissertation of Martin Schmidt: *Die Bedeutung Luthers für John Wesleys Bekehrung*.⁹⁶ He makes the point that the Reformed concept of faith won out over the Pietist, although both concepts were present. He would make experience more important for Wesley, and says that he brought together Luther's hidden and revealed God. Quite recently we have also from the pen of Schmidt a translation, *The Young Wesley*, from the German *Der junge Wesley als Heidenmissionar und Missionstheologe*,⁹⁷ in which he shows how Wesley's great understanding of and interest in missions bears on his going to Georgia and on his subsequent conversion.

More directly related to the elements of Calvinism in Wesley is the dissertation by David Shipley, "Methodist Arminianism in the Theology of John Fletcher,"⁹⁸ in which much of Wesley's own position is elucidated. Both men maintained that the role of man in salvation is permissive, passive only, not to be described in terms of co-operation. A further development of these themes is found in Shipley's article, "Wesley and Some Calvinistic Controversies," in the *Drew Gateway*.⁹⁹ Robert Cushman carries on the discussion in "Theological Landmarks in the Revival under Wesley," in *RnL*,¹⁰⁰ where he identifies "four doctrinal pillars," and in a fine article in Anderson's *Methodism*. Among the several useful unpublished dissertations is that by Wallace Gray: "The Place of Reason in the Theology of John Wesley."¹⁰¹ Along the same line is W. J. Ong's article, "Peter Ramus and the Naming of Methodism," in the *Journal of the History of Ideas*.¹⁰² He traces the origin of the term in Wesley back through Ramism to Aristotle's "method." Attention to the more immediately Christian aspects of Wesley's thought is in the unpublished dissertation of Paul Hoon: "The Soteriology of John Wesley."¹⁰³ Another is "The Work of the Holy Spirit in the Theology of John Wesley," by Lycurgus Monroe Starkey.¹⁰⁴ A very important question in connection with Wesleyan theology is raised by Stanley Frost, now Dean of the School of Theology in McGill University, in *Die Autoritätslehre in den Werken John Wesleys*.¹⁰⁵ He deals in turn with authority of the Church, of the Bible, and of experience. The latter is found to be not indispensable. Here

Frost properly signalizes Wesley's foundation on the Bible as a control of experience. In the problem of Wesley's relations to the official theology of the Church of England Nolan Harmon's "John Wesley and the Articles of Religion," being a parallel columned comparison of the Methodist Articles and the Thirty-Nine Articles, is helpful.¹⁰⁶

Justification and sanctification are matters of concern in Erich von Eicken's dissertation, *Rechtfertigung und Heiligung bei Wesley dargestellt unter Vergleichung mit den Anschauungen Luthers und des Lutherthums*.¹⁰⁷ A peculiarity of this work is the double-column German and English footnotes. Another German dissertation deals with a similar topic: *Heil und Heiligung bei John Wesley*.¹⁰⁸ Here he is shown to be close to the Reformed position on main points, modified by Arminian interpretations and the emphasis on sanctification, by which God can break completely the power of sin. Wesleyanism is called a new form of Puritanical Pietism (!). Special use is made of the *Notes upon the New Testament*. A German dissertation is by Percy Scott, *John Wesleys Lehre von der Heiligung verglichen mit einem lutherisch-pietistischen Beispiel*.¹⁰⁹ An unusual comparison is made in Chester Pennington's unpublished dissertation, "The Essentially Wesleyan Form of the Doctrine of Redemption in the Writings of Emil Brunner."¹¹⁰ An old issue is reworked in W. E. Sangster's "Wesley and Sanctification" in *LQHR*.¹¹¹ A much fuller and definitive treatment is given in the unpublished dissertation by Colin Williams, "Methodism and the Ecumenical Movement,"¹¹² where the problem of imperfect perfection is propounded. And one of the most valuable accounts is *Wesley and Sanctification* by Harold Lindström.¹¹³ Both of these works are fully annotated and seriously set forth in the light of all available evidence. Lindström is more sanguine of the ultimate significance of the special doctrine of sanctification than is Williams. Another approach of real value is found in W. E. Sangster's book, *The Path to Perfection*.¹¹⁴ An attempt is made to deal systematically with the problem, the biblical, theological, and psychological grounds, and the case for modern belief. He finds a weakness in understanding of the social implications of the doctrine. George Turner in *The More Excellent Way* deals with the same theme, follows Cell in part.¹¹⁵ One should list also the older Norwegian work of O. Hagen, *Litt om Wesleys lære om kristelig fullkommenhet*,¹¹⁶ which this reviewer has not seen and could not read if he had.

On the important subject of ordination we have the book by John Nuelsen, *Die Ordination im Methodismus*,¹¹⁷ which is well annotated original research. He views British, American, and Continental aspects of the issue, and concentrates on the position of the founder himself. See also Edgar Thompson's study of the consecration of Thomas

Coke.¹¹⁸ A new approach to a newly alive issue in Methodist study is found in the unpublished dissertation of Paul Sanders, "An Appraisal of John Wesley's Sacramentalism in the Evolution of Early American Methodism."¹¹⁹ Although this work deals with the American scene, about half of it is devoted to Wesleyan foundations. Baptism is discussed in the same author's "John Wesley and Baptismal Regeneration" in *RnL*.¹²⁰

F. Other Methodist Leaders

No attempt has been made in this survey to cover exhaustively all aspects of Methodist biography in the period under consideration. Many "memoirs" have very little historical value. On the other hand, one of the features of the period under consideration is the revival of interest in contemporaries of John Wesley who may have suffered from proximity to greatness. This is certainly true of brother Charles, whom several historians have sought recently to rescue from the double oblivion of proximity and blood relationship. A standard, although by no means definitive, biography is the Drew Lectureship study of F. L. Wiseman, *Charles Wesley*.¹²¹ After an introductory chapter on the early years a series of topics are developed without strict chronological sequence. More recently Frank Baker has summarized his insights in a small book entitled *Charles Wesley as Revealed by his Letters*.¹²² He points out the difficulty in study of the primary sources, especially the letters, of which less than half have been published. Many of these unpublished letters are quoted in part of his essay. A larger book, well written but not annotated nor based on new findings is *Charles Wesley and his Colleagues*, by Charles W. Flint,¹²³ another attempt to recover the individual significance of the younger brother. Many denominational articles, not listed here, have had the same purpose. Quite significant, however, is the issue for October, 1957, of *LQHR*,¹²⁴ devoted almost entirely to articles on Charles. A. Kingsley Lloyd deals with "Charles Wesley's Debt to Matthew Henry" in *LQHR*,¹²⁵ which studies Wesley's use of biblical commentaries.

A new edition of Albert Belden, *George Whitefield*,¹²⁶ signalizes renewed interest in the spectacular colleague and goad of the Wesleys. The somewhat defensive and adulatory treatment in this book is balanced by the more objective but appreciative, *George Whitefield, Wayfaring Witness*, by Stuart Henry.¹²⁷ This latter is not a full biography, but a study of preaching appended to a brief biographical summary. What there is of it is good. It seems that no stretch of good will or admiration will make much of a theologian out of Whitefield. A. O. Aldredge has investigated "George Whitefield's Georgia Controversies" in the *Journal of Southern History*.¹²⁸

Surprisingly little has been done on the "second level" of leaders. The small book by Cyril Davey, *The Man Who Wanted the World*,¹²⁹ adds little to our understanding of Thomas Coke—nor does it profess to. The same author writes on the "Significance of Thomas Coke" in *LQHR*.¹³⁰ Warren T. Smith has "Thomas Coke and Early American Methodism" as a dissertation, available on microcard.¹³¹ This is a significant work, including an essay on previous work on Coke, pp. x-xviii. After two chapters on the English background the author follows a generally chronological survey of the nine trips to America and the intermingled work in the West Indies, England, the Continent, and India (the latter only potentially, like Moses on Horeb). He concludes that Coke suffered because of his ambition and because of the brevity of his visits to America, which prevented his real understanding of the situation. Yet he deserves the title, "Father of Methodist Missions." John Cennick received attention upon the occasion of his bicentenary from William Leary in *WHSProc.*,¹³² and Frank Baker prepared a study of his writings in the same journal in several issues.¹³³ An interesting reprint of one of Wesley's own originals of 1786 is *The Life of Silas Told, Written by Himself*,¹³⁴ illustrative of early Methodist work in prisons. A fine study of *Thomas Jackson, Methodist Patriarch*, is by E. Gordon Rupp.¹³⁵

Among the English splinter groups modern biographies have appeared on two important figures of Primitive Methodism: *William Clowes, 1780-1851*,¹³⁶ and *Hugh Bourne, 1772-1852*,¹³⁷ both by John T. Wilkinson and both scholarly and able studies. He also has a centenary tribute in *WHSProc.*¹³⁸ Several articles in volume 177 of *LQHR* are devoted to him and to Primitive Methodism.¹³⁹ W. E. Farndale writes on "Hugh Bourne and the 'Spiritual Manifestation'" in *WHSProc.*¹⁴⁰ Appropriate for listing at this point is the small essay, *The Secret of Mow Cop; A New Appraisal of the Origins of Primitive Methodism*.¹⁴¹ Concerning more recent history perhaps the *Festschrift* of tribute to John Scott Lidgett, British Methodist who died in 1953, should also be mentioned.¹⁴²

G. Special Aspects of Methodism

Two of the more readable books—certainly not profound ones—are *The Early Methodist People*¹⁴³ and *More About the Early Methodist People*¹⁴⁴ by Leslie Church. These are both based on diaries and records of the less important leaders, especially class leaders, and discuss a variety of topics, including spiritual experience, class meetings, personal ethics, group attitudes, etc. More serious studies of lay participation have been published in German. One is Hermann Mammel,

*Die Laienmitarbeit in der Methodistenkirche als Vorbild für eine kommende Deutsch-evangelische Volkskirche.*¹⁴⁵ A more recent and comprehensive study is Theophil Funk, *Die Anfänge der Laienmitarbeit im Methodismus.*¹⁴⁶ This latter is number five in the *Beiträge zur Geschichte des Methodismus*.

On the central problem of the relation of Methodism to the Church of England A. H. W. Harrison writes in *The Separation of Methodism from the Church of England*.¹⁴⁷ This is another of the Wesley Historical Society Lectures. From the Anglican point of view is *John Wesley and the Church of England* by William J. Sparrow-Simpson,¹⁴⁸ who says that conditions in America and the prevailing Erastianism of the eighteenth century explain, if they do not justify, Wesley's ordinations for America. His approach on Church, ministry, and ordination are clearly Anglican. Along the same theme runs Edgar Thompson in *Wesley: Apostolic Man*,¹⁴⁹ which concentrates on the ordination of Coke, maintains that Wesley was not disobedient to the Church, and leaves open the question whether he was justified under the circumstances. Another aspect is discussed in Arthur Whitney, *The Basis of Opposition to Methodism in England in the Eighteenth Century*,¹⁵⁰ a dissertation which tries to discover the real reasons for the persecution of Methodists. One person involved in the criticism of Methodism is considered in "George Crabbe and Methodism" in *LQHR*.¹⁵¹ A long view of the schism is taken by R. A. Edwards in "Needless Schism: A Comment on the Bicentenary of Wesley's Conversion" in the *Hibbert Journal*.¹⁵² This Anglican view is answered in a Methodist comment by A. W. Harrison.¹⁵³

A cultural approach to Methodism is well made by Frederick C. Gill in *The Romantic Movement and Methodism*,¹⁵⁴ which seeks to find roots of the latter in the former. Rather were they not parallel? Literary references, allusions and influences provide the matter for Thomas Shepherd's study, *Methodism and the Literature of the Eighteenth Century*.¹⁵⁵ A briefer treatment is found in "Methodism and the Romantic Movement" by F. Brompton Harvey in *LQHR*.¹⁵⁶

A series of studies have brought Methodism into relation with several major Protestant influences. Those dealing with Lutheran, Calvinistic, and Catholic connections, as well as the basic relation to the Church of England, have already been listed. Another direction is pointed out in Clifford Towlson, *Moravian and Methodist*.¹⁵⁷ This abridged dissertation, based on thorough study of documents, covers not only the early influences and conflicts, but also continuing relations through the eighteenth century, including the negotiations for union in 1785-86. The main concern is Moravian influence on Methodism; but

one chapter goes in the opposite direction. Still another connection is elucidated by Frank Baker in "The Relations between the Society of Friends and Early Methodism," in *LQHR*.¹⁵⁸ John Bowmer discusses the same thing in both *LQHR* and *RnL*.¹⁵⁹

"The Organization of the Methodist Church in the Time of John Wesley" is the general subject of Norman Mumford in *LQHR*.¹⁶⁰ A more complete investigation of one aspect of early Methodist polity, both in England and in America, is Frederick A. Norwood, *Church Membership in the Methodist Tradition*,¹⁶¹ in which the development of standards for membership in class, society, and church are studied on the basis of primary records. Bernard Russell wrote a dissertation on Wesley's discipline.¹⁶² Articles on various aspects of early polity are Robert Wearmouth, "The First Methodist Conference—June 25-30, 1744,"¹⁶³ Frederick Hunter, "The Origin of the Methodist Quarterly Meeting,"¹⁶⁴ and Leslie Church, "The Call to Preach in Early Methodism,"¹⁶⁵ all in *LQHR*; and Duncan Coomer, "The Local Preachers in Early Methodism,"¹⁶⁶ Frank Baker, "Thomas Maxfield's First Sermon,"¹⁶⁷ and Wesley F. Swift, "The Women Itinerant Preachers of Early Methodism,"¹⁶⁸ all in *WHSProc*.

Although this survey is not directly concerned with doctrinal interpretation as such, the following books, which seek to define the Methodist understanding of the Church, may be mentioned: *The Nature of the Christian Church, According to the Teaching of the Methodists*,¹⁶⁹ a production of the British Conference; Edgar W. Thompson, *The Methodist Doctrine of the Church*,¹⁷⁰ and *idem*, *The Methodist Principles of Church Order*.¹⁷¹ Others might also be listed.

Educational contributions are dealt with in Alfred Body, *John Wesley and Education*,¹⁷² Horace Mathews, *Methodism and the Education of the People, 1791-1851*.¹⁷³ The special concern of the former is the Kingswood school plan, and it contains several useful documentary appendices. The latter covers Sunday Schools, culture, publications, and education for the ministry. An unpublished dissertation covers much of the same area.¹⁷⁴

Miscellaneous articles are those by Frank Baker on Methodists in the Rebellion of 1745¹⁷⁵ and in relation to the Erskines,¹⁷⁶ both in *LQHR*, and by H. Belshaw, "Eighteenth-Century Wit and Methodism," in the same publication.¹⁷⁷ A regional book not directly connected with the work of John Wesley is Richard D. Moore, *Methodism in the Channel Islands*.¹⁷⁸

H. Social and Political

A relatively few authors have made a major contribution to the understanding of social and political implications and involvements in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries in England. Building on the influential judgments of Elie Halévy, G. M. Trevelyan, and William Lecky, these scholars have studied exhaustively many aspects of the area. One of the earliest and in many ways the most influential on later work is Wellman J. Warner's now standard *The Wesleyan Movement in the Industrial Revolution*.¹⁷⁰ This book tries to do for Methodism what Max Weber did for Calvinism in his *Protestant Ethic and the Spirit of Capitalism*. Indeed the approach of "social history" is much the same. Although the primary emphasis is on the economic relationships, some attention is given to the political. He takes seriously the Wesleyan religious impact on society—and the later opposite influence. A much briefer general treatment is J. W. E. Sommer, *John Wesley und die soziale Frage*,¹⁸⁰ half of which consists of appendices—two documents and a sizable bibliography. A most enthusiastic statement of Wesley's beneficent influence is *England: Before and After Wesley*, by J. Wesley Bready.¹⁸¹ Except for the fact that the author's enthusiasm runs away with his judgment, this is a good book. More moderate and well balanced are the excellent trio by Maldwyn Edwards: *John Wesley and the Eighteenth Century*,¹⁸² *After Wesley*,¹⁸³ and *Methodism and England*.¹⁸⁴ The second of these covers the period 1791 to 1845, and the third carries the story down to 1932. All concentrate on the political aspects of social problems. A good supplementary book on the period covered by the second of Edwards' is Ernest R. Taylor, *Methodism and Politics, 1791-1851*.¹⁸⁵ This well-annotated study more carefully distinguishes chronological periods in the shift from liberalism to conservatism. Both authors lean toward a political orientation rather than a theological one. An impressive quartet of books are from the pen of Robert F. Wearmouth over a twenty-year period, all dealing with industrial relations: *Methodism and the Common People of the Eighteenth Century*,¹⁸⁶ *Methodism and the Working-Class Movements of England, 1800-1850*,¹⁸⁷ *Methodism and the Struggle of the Working Classes, 1850-1900*,¹⁸⁸ and *The Social and Political Influence of Methodism in the Twentieth Century*.¹⁸⁹ This series, which begins with the proposition that Methodism "proved itself to be the most powerful and understanding friend the working masses had during the whole of the eighteenth century," proceeds to investigate the two main lines of influence, individualist and collectivist, down to the present. The last volume is concerned to a greater degree with political factors. A specialized study of value, but not exhaustive, is Kathleen McArthur, *The Economic Ethics of John Wesley*.¹⁹⁰ Lamar Cooper is completing work

on "Wesley's Social Ethic" at Union Theological Seminary. Some of Wesley's ethical judgments on economic issues of the day are discussed. An article by Robert Kingdon that develops one aspect more fully than McArthur is "Laissez-faire or Government Control: a Problem for John Wesley," in *Church History*.¹⁹¹ Two other articles are Peter Collingwood, "Prison Visitation in the Methodist Revival," in *LQHR*,¹⁹² and M. T. Hodgen, "The Negro in the Anthropology of John Wesley," in the *Journal of Negro History*.¹⁹³

I. Worship

The Methodist Church on both sides of the Atlantic has felt the impact of the liturgical revival that manifests itself so widely in so many different facets of modern Christianity. A very useful statement from a largely historical standpoint is John Bishop, *Methodist Worship*.¹⁹⁴ This abbreviated dissertation is a serious study with no radical hobbies to ride, provides a setting in the two main forms of worship, Catholic and Evangelical, and then discusses in turn worship in the broad free church tradition and in the Methodist tradition. Maynard French has provided an interesting but not completely Wesleyan form of worship patterned after Wesley's Sunday Service, *The John Wesley Prayer Book*,¹⁹⁵ designed to "dress up" worship. Wesley Swift compares "Methodism and the Book of Common Prayer"¹⁹⁶ and studies "The Sunday Service of the Methodists"¹⁹⁷ in *WHSPProc.*, and Frederick Hunter seeks the "Sources of Wesley's Revision of the Prayer Book in 1784-8," in the same journal.¹⁹⁸ Two other small studies deal with the same area: *John Wesley's Prayers*, edited by Frederick C. Gill,¹⁹⁹ and *The Wesley Orders of Common Prayer*, a publication of the National Methodist Student Movement in the United States introduced by E. C. Hobbs.²⁰⁰ A basic piece of research which relates themes of worship with theological factors for both the Wesleyan background and American developments is the unpublished dissertation by Paul S. Sanders, "An Appraisal of John Wesley's Sacramentalism in the Evolution of Early American Methodism."²⁰¹

Several works dealing with Methodist hymnody have larger importance than for this limited field. There is Henry Bett's *The Hymns of Methodism*,²⁰² revised in 1945 from the first edition of 1913. Besides distinguishing between John and Charles as authors (so far as that is possible), Bett writes on the language of the hymns, relation to contemporary events, the Bible, church history, and their literary quality as poems. More recent books have brought about a better understanding of the subject. Among the best are George Findlay, *Christ's Standard Bearer: A Study in the Hymns of Charles Wesley*,²⁰³ and the modest effort of R. N. Flew, *The Hymns of Charles Wesley*.²⁰⁴ Ber-

nard Manning compares *The Hymns of Wesley and Watts*,²⁰⁵ and has three articles in *LQHR*.²⁰⁶ Robert Stevenson has an article on "John Wesley's First Hymnbook" in the *Review of Religion*,²⁰⁷ and a chapter on the same subject in his *Patterns of Protestant Church Music*.²⁰⁸ On the strong connection between John Wesley and German hymnody one may consult John Nuelson, *John Wesley und das deutsche Kirchenlied*,²⁰⁹ a serious study that deals with all angles at which he influenced or was influenced by the German hymns. An appendix gives the German text and Wesley's translations. Two articles in *LQHR* discuss this same topic: Henry Bett, "John Wesley's Translations of German Hymns,"²¹⁰ and Oliver Beckerlegge, "John Wesley and the German Hymns,"²¹¹ which latter adds considerably to the former. Two small collections of hymns have been made by the Epworth Press: *Fifty Hymns of Charles Wesley*²¹² and *Wesley's Prayers and Praises*.²¹³ To these should most certainly be added the new *Wesley Hymn Book*, compiled by Franz Hildebrandt and privately printed.²¹⁴ *The Music of the Methodist Hymn Book*, by James Lightwood,²¹⁵ provides encyclopedic information on this important aspect of hymnology sometimes completely ignored. The hymn book is the edition of 1933. There is a brief but valuable historical introduction.

Certain of the practices of worship in the Methodist tradition are dealt with in the following books: Norman Mumford, "The Administration of the Sacrament of Baptism in the Methodist Church," in *LQHR*,²¹⁶ which compares the traditions in the separate English groups; John C. Bowmer, *The Sacrament of the Lord's Supper in Early Methodism*,²¹⁷ supplemented by "Wesley's Revision of the Communion Service in the 'The Sunday Service of the Methodists'"²¹⁸ in *LQHR*; E. Gordon Rupp, "The Holy Communion in the Methodist Church," in H. Martin's *The Holy Communion: A Symposium*,²¹⁹ Frederick Hunter, "The Origins of Wesley's Covenant Service,"²²⁰ and Frank Baker, "The Beginnings of the Methodist Covenant Service,"²²¹ both in *LQHR*; and the latter's *Methodism and the Love-Feast*, a small paper-back that gives a historical survey leading up to "How to Conduct a Love-Feast."²²² Paul Sanders has written two series of articles in *The Pastor* on the Sunday Service and on Methodist liturgy.²²³

J. Nineteenth and Twentieth Century

Relatively little research has been directed to the later history of Methodism in England. Interest has been diverted either to America or to the mission fields. A good brief introduction to the transition from the era of Wesley to the post-Wesleyan scene is Maldwyn Edwards, "The Years of Unrest: 1790-1800," in *LQHR*.²²⁴ The prime

question in this crucial decade was that of authority. Bernard Crosby discusses "Methodist Evangelism, 1800-1820," in the same journal.²²⁵ A short but concise survey of the period of Jabez Bunting, the so-called "Methodist pope," is found in John Kent's *Jabez Bunting, the Last Wesleyan*.²²⁶ "It is no sin for a man to think that our discipline is wrong," said that worthy, "provided he quits us." E. Dale Dunlap has filled a great need with his unpublished dissertation, "Methodist Theology in Great Britain in the Nineteenth Century, with Special Reference to the Theology of Adam Clarke, Richard Watson, and William Burt Pope."²²⁷ He concludes that Methodism has at its heart a soteriology completely gracious and Christ-centered, but that early in the century the original doctrine of prevenient grace gave way to cooperant grace. Later in the century Pope reemphasized prevenient grace, but liberalism continued its influence. F. Pilkington deals briefly with "Methodism in Arnold Bennett's Novels" in the *Contemporary Review*.²²⁸ An illustrated festival history of the union of three branches of English Methodism in 1932 is Richard Wycherley's *The Pageant of Methodist Union*.²²⁹ After summarizing the history of the three branches the author analyzes the lengthy negotiations, and finally tells the story of the uniting conference. The text is largely a frame for the pictures. A compilation of British Conference legislation up to 1952 is edited by Harold Spencer and Edwin Finch under the title, *The Constitutional Practice and Discipline of The Methodist Church*.²³⁰ *The United Methodist Free Churches* is the labor of love of Oliver Beckerlegge, who speaks with feeling of the English Free Methodist tradition.²³¹

(To be continued)

1. Willey, Basil. *The Eighteenth Century Background. Studies in the Idea of Nature in the Thought of the Period*. London: Chatto & Windus, 1940; New York: Columbia University Press, 1953, 301 p.
2. Flew, Robert Newton. *The Idea of Perfection in Christian Theology*. London: Oxford University Press, 1934, 422 p.
3. Knox, Ronald A. *Enthusiasm*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1950, 622 p. Cf. also N. P. Williams and C. Harris, eds. *Northern Catholicism*. London, SPCK, 1933.
4. Creed, John M. and J. S. Boys-Smith (eds.). *Religious Thought in the Eighteenth Century*. Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press, 1934, 301 p.
5. Stromberg, Roland N. *Religious Liberalism in Eighteenth-Century England*. London: Oxford University Press, 1954, 192 p.
6. Sykes, Norman. *Church and State in England in the XVIIIth Century*. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1934, 456 p.
7. Loane, Marcus. *Oxford and the Evangelical Succession*. London: Lutterworth Press, 1950, 300 p.; *Cambridge and the Evangelical Succession*. London: Lutterworth Press, 1952, 276 p.
8. Elliott-Binns, L. E. *The Early Evangelicals: A Religious and Social Study*. London: Lutterworth Press, 1953, 464 p. See also Davies, G. C. B. *The Early Cornish Evangelicals (1735-60)*. London: SPCK, 1951, 229 p.
9. Pinson, Koppel S. *Pietism as a Factor in the Rise of German Nationalism*. New York: Columbia University Press, 1943, 227 p.
10. Hudson, Winthrop S. *The Great Tradition of the American Churches*. New York: Harper and Brothers, 1953, 282 p.

11. Osborn, Ronald E. *The Spirit of American Christianity*. New York: Harper and Brothers, 1958, 241 p.
12. Hopkins, Charles Howard. *The Rise of the Social Gospel in American Protestantism*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1940, 352 p.
13. Smith, Timothy L. *Revivalism and Social Reform in Mid-Nineteenth-Century America*. New York: Abingdon Press, 1957, 253 p.
- II. ENGLISH METHODISM**
14. Harrison, A. W. "Fifty Years of Studies in Methodist History" *WHS Proc.*, XXIV (1943-44), 17-26.
15. Fortney, Edward L. "The Literature of the History of Methodism" *RnL*, XXIV (1954-55), 443-51.
- A. Primary Sources**
16. Wesley, John. *The Journal of the Rev. John Wesley, A.M.* London: Epworth Press, 1938, 8 vols. Nehemiah Curnock, ed.
17. Wesley, John. *John Wesley's Journal*. New York: Philosophical Library, 1951, 433 p.
18. Wesley, John. *The Letters of the Rev. John Wesley, A.M.* London: Epworth Press, 1931, 8 vols. John Telford, ed.
19. Wesley, John. *Selected Letters of John Wesley*. New York: Philosophical Library, 1956, 244 p. Frederick C. Gill, ed.
20. Wesley, John. *Wesley's Standard Sermons*. London: Epworth Press, 1935, 2nd annotated edition, 2 vols. Edward H. Sugden, ed. See also *The Forty-four Sermons and Notes on the Forty-four Sermons*, both by John Lawson, Epworth Press, 1948.
21. Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 14 vols.
22. Cameron, Richard M. *The Rise of Methodism, a Source Book*. New York: Philosophical Library, 1954, 397 p.
23. Burtner, Robert W. and Robert E. Chiles. *A Compend of Wesley's Theology*. New York: Abingdon Press, 1954, 302 p.
- B. General Treatments**
24. Carter, Henry. *The Methodist Heritage*. London: Epworth Press, 1951, 246 p.
25. Rupp, E. Gordon. "Some Reflections on the Origin and Development of the English Methodist Tradition, 1738-1938" *LQHR*, 178 (1953), 166-175.
26. Kent, John H. S. "M. Elie Halévy on Methodism" *WHS Proc.*, XXIX (1953-54), 84-91.
27. Gorce, A. de la. "Wesley, réformateur de l'Angleterre" *Revue des Deux Mondes*, XLIV (1938), 639-57.
28. Kristoffersen, A. *Methodismens Veren*. Oslo, Norway: Methodismen, 1938.
29. McConnell, Francis J. "New Interest in John Wesley" *Journal of Religion*, XX (1940), 340-58.
30. Anderson, W. R., ed. *Methodism*. New York: Methodist Publishing House, 1947, 317 p.
31. Luecock, H. E.; Hutchinson, Paul; and Goodloe, Robert W. *The Story of Methodism*. New York: Abingdon-Cokesbury Press, 1949, 528 p.
32. Clark, Elmer T. *An Album of Methodist History*. New York: Abingdon-Cokesbury Press, 1952, 336 p.
- C. Wesley Biography**
33. Simon, John S. *John Wesley, the Last Phase*. London: Epworth Press, 1934, 355 p. Actually finished by A. W. Harrison.
34. Schmidt, Martin L. *John Wesley*. Zürich: Gotthelf, 1953, 334 p.
35. Vulliamy, C. E. *John Wesley*. London: Bles, 1931; New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1932, 370 p.
36. Lee, Umphrey. *The Lord's Horseman*. New York: Century Company, 1928, 358 p.; reprint Abingdon Press, 1954, 200 p.
37. McConnell, Francis J. *John Wesley*. New York: Abingdon Press, 1938, 355 p.
38. Piette, Maximin. *John Wesley in the Evolution of Protestantism*. New York: Sheed and Ward, 1937, 569 p.
39. Todd, John M. *John Wesley and the Catholic Church*. London: Hodder & Stoughton, 1958, 195 p.
40. Harrison, Grace Elsie. *Son to Susanna; the Private Life of John Wesley*. London: Ivor Michalson and Watson, 1937; Nashville: Cokesbury Press, 1938, 377 p.
41. Pyke, Richard. *John Wesley Came This Way*. London: Epworth Press, 1938, 159 p.
42. Chureh, Leslie F. *Knight of the Burning Heart*. London: Epworth Press, 1938, 185 p.
43. Brailsford, Mabel R. *A Tale of Two Brothers*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1954, 301 p.
44. Edwards, Maldwyn. *Family Circle*. London: Epworth Press, 1949, 192 p.; also *The Astonishing Youth*. London: Epworth Press, 1959, 128 p.
- D. Wesley—Special Aspects**
45. Douglass, P. F. *Wesleys at Oxford: the Religion of University Men*. Bryn Mawr, Pa.: Bryn Mawr Press, 1953, 107 p.
46. Crook, William. *The Ancestry of the Wesleys*. London: Epworth Press, 1938.
47. Maser, Frederick E. "The Human Side of John Wesley" *RnL*, XXVII (1957-58), 544-56.
48. Cameron, Richard M. "The Little Flowers of John Wesley" *RnL*, XXXIII (1943-54), 267-78.

49. Maser, Frederick E. "Preface to Victory: Wesley in Georgia" *RnL*, XXV (1955-56), 280-93.
50. *LQHR*, 163 (1938), 168-224.
51. Rattenbury, J. Ernest. *The Conversion of the Wesleys*. London: Epworth Press, 1938, 243 p.
52. McNeill, John T. "Luther at Aldersgate" *LQHR*, 164 (1939), 200-17.
53. Doughty, William L. *John Wesley, His Conference and His Preachers*. London: Epworth Press, 1944, 79 p.
54. Chandler, Douglas R. "John Wesley and His Preachers" *RnL*, XXIV (1954-55), 241-48.
55. Doughty, William L. *John Wesley, Preacher*. London: Epworth Press, 1955, 213 p.
56. Bishop, John. "John Wesley as a Preacher" *RnL*, XXVI (1956-57), 264-73.
57. Schempf, Johannes. "Seelsorge und Seelenführung bei John Wesley" Stuttgart, 1949. Dissertation.
58. Hulme, Thomas Ferrier. *Voices of the New Room*. New York: Abingdon Press, 1931, 250 p.
59. Haire, Robert. *Wesley's One-and-Twenty Visits to Ireland*. London: Epworth Press, 1947, 186 p.
60. Bowmer, John C. "John Wesley and Ireland" *LQHR*, 178 (1953), 252-62; 179 (1954), 38-45.
61. Swift, Wesley F. *Methodism in Scotland*. London: Epworth Press, 1947, 96 p.
62. Roberts, Griffith T. "Wesley's First Society in Wales" *WHSPProc.*, XVII (1949-50), 111-16, 125-28.
63. Brown, H. M. "Rise of Methodism in Cornwall" *Church Quarterly Review*, 142 (1946), 78-91.
64. Bretherton, F. F. "Wesley's Visits to Holland" *WHSPProc.*, XIX (1933-34), 106-12.
65. Baker, Eric W. *A Herald of the Evangelical Revival*. London: Epworth Press, 1948, 203 p.
66. Green, John Brazier. *John Wesley and William Law*. London: The Epworth Press, 1945, 224 p.
67. Hutchinson, F. E. "John Wesley and George Herbert" *LQHE*, 161 (1936), 439-55.
68. Henderson, G. D. "A Scottish Teacher of the Wesleys" *LQHE*, 164 (1939), 471-82.
69. Belshaw, Harry. "The Influence of John Wesley on Dr. Johnson's Religion" *LQHE*, 168 (1943), 226-34.
70. Hughes, H. Trevor. "Jeremy Taylor and John Wesley" *LQHR*, 174 (1949), 296-304.
71. Baker, Frank. "Jonathan Swift and the Wesleys" *LQHR*, 179 (1954), 290-300.
72. Doughty, W. L. "Thomas Fuller and the Wesleys" *LQHE*, 180 (1955), 42-7.
73. Vallins, G. H. *The Wesleys and the English Language*. London: Epworth Press, 1957, 88 p.
74. Jackson, George. "John Wesley as a Bookman" *LQHE*, 160 (1935), 294-305. Found also in *RnL*, IV (1935), 599-608.
75. Baker, Frank. "A Study of John Wesley's Readings" *LQHE*, 168 (1943), 140-45, 234-42.
76. Lawton, George. "Proverbs and Proverbial Echoes in John Wesley's Letters" *WHSPProc.*, XXVI (1947-48), 111-14, 129-34; XXVIII (1951-52), 2-7, 25-27; XXIX (1953-54), 58-65; XXX (1955-56), 73-81, 108-13.
77. Ewens, J. B. "Henry Carey, John Wesley, and 'Namby - Pamby'" *LQHE*, 161 (1936), 40-51.
78. Arnett, William M. "John Wesley—Man of One Book . . ." Madison, New Jersey: Drew University, 1954. Dissertation.
79. Hill, A. Wesley. *John Wesley Among the Physicians*. London: Epworth Press, 1958, 135 p.
80. Schofield, R. E. "John Wesley and Science in 18th Century England" *Isis*, XLIV (1935), 331-40.
- E. Wesley—Theology
81. Cell, George Croft. *The Rediscovery of John Wesley*. New York: Henry Holt and Company, 1935, 420 p.
82. Lee, Umphrey. *John Wesley and Modern Religion*. Nashville: Cokesbury Press, 1936, 354 p.
83. Lee, Umphrey. *The Historical Backgrounds of Early Methodist Enthusiasm*. New York: Columbia University Press, 1931, 176 p.
84. Bett, Henry. *The Spirit of Methodism*. London: Epworth Press, 1937, 254 p.
85. Cannon, William R. *The Theology of John Wesley*. New York: Abingdon-Cokesbury, 1946, 284 p.
86. Rattenbury, John E. *The Evangelical Doctrines of Charles Wesley's Hymns*. London: Epworth Press, 1941, 365 p.
87. Rattenbury, John E. *The Eucharistic Hymns of John and Charles Wesley*. London: Epworth Press, 1948, 253 p.
88. Flew, Robert Newton. *The Hymns of Charles Wesley*. London: Epworth Press, 1953, 79 p.
89. Hildebrandt, Franz. *Christianity According to the Wesleys*. London: Epworth Press, 1956, 80 p.
90. Williams, Colin. "Methodism and the Ecumenical Movement" Madison, New Jersey: Drew University, 1958. Dissertation.
91. *Methodismus in Dokumenten*. Zürich: Christl. Vereinsbuchhandlung: (1) Th. Spörri, "Die Lehre von der Kirche"; (2) J. W. E. Sommer, "Die christ-

- liche Erfahrung im Methodismus"; (3) Th. Spörri, "Die Basis des ökumenischen Rates und unser Bekenntnis zur Gottheit Jesu Christi"; (4) Th. Spörri, "Was bedeutet uns die christliche Taufe?"; (5) Th. Spörri, "Das Wesentliche metjodistischer Theologie"; (6) E. Gordon Rupp, "Die Zukunft der metjodistischen Tradition"; (7) Paulus Scharpff, "Unsere theologische Predigerausbildung früher und heute; (8) Ferdinand Sigg, "Das Versetzungsproblem im Methodismus."
92. *LQHR*, 184 (July, 1959). Included is the official report.
93. Baker, Frank. "John Wesley and the 'Imitatio Christi'" *LQHE*, 166 (1941), 74-87.
94. Faulkner, J. A. "Wesley the Mystic" *LQE*, 153 (1930), 145-160.
95. Hildebrandt, Franz. *From Luther to Wesley*. London: Lutterworth Press, 1951, 224 p.
96. Schmidt, Martin. *Die Bedeutung Luthers für John Wesleys Bekehrung*. Bremen: , 1938.
97. Schmidt, Martin. *The Young Wesley*. London: Epworth Press, 1958, 48 p., tr. by L. A. Fletcher from *Der junge Wesley als Heidenmissionar und Missionstheologe*. Gütersloh, 1955, 45 p.
98. Shipley, David Clarke. "Methodist Arminianism in the Theology of John Fletcher" New Haven: Yale University, 1942. Dissertation.
99. Shipley, David Clarke. "Wesley and Some Calvinistic Controversies" *Drew Gateway*, XXV (1955), 195-206.
100. Cushman, Robert E. "Theological Landmarks in the Revival under Wesley" *RnL*, XXVII (1957-58), 105-18.
101. Gray, Wallace. "The Place of Reason in the Theology of John Wesley" Nashville: Vanderbilt University, 1953. Dissertation.
102. Ong, W. J. "Peter Ramus and the Naming of Methodism" *Journal of the History of Ideas*, XIV (1953), 235-48.
103. Hoon, Paul W. "The Soteriology of John Wesley" Edinburgh: University of Edinburgh, 1936. Dissertation.
104. Starkey, Lycurgus Monroe, Jr. "The Work of the Holy Spirit in the Theology of John Wesley" New York: Columbia University, 1953. Dissertation. Cf. the older study of Sherman P. Young "The Doctrine of the Holy Spirit in Relation to Methodist Theology" Madison, New Jersey: Drew University, 1930. Dissertation.
105. Frost, Stanley B. *Die Autoritätslehre in den Werken John Westleys*. Munich: Ernst Reinhardt, 1938, 110 p.
106. Harmon, Nolan B. and John W. Bardsley. "John Wesley and the Articles of Religion" *RnL*, XXII (1952-53), 280-91.
107. Eicken, Erich von. "Rechtfertigung und Heiligung bei Wesley dargestellt unter Vergleichung mit den Anschauungen Luthers und des Lutherthums" Heidelberg: University of Heidelberg, 1934, 69 p. Dissertation.
108. Lerch, D. *Heil und Heiligung bei John Wesley*. Zürich: Christliche Vereinsbuchhandlung, 1941, 180 p.
109. Scott, Percy. "John Wesley's Lehre von der Heiligung verglichen mit einem lutherisch-pietistischen Beispiel" Berlin: University of Berlin, 1939. Dissertation.
110. Pennington, Chester A. "The Essentially Wesleyan Form of the Doctrine of Redemption in the Writings of Emil Brunner" Madison, New Jersey: Drew University, 1948. Dissertation.
111. Sangster, W. E. "Wesley and Sanctification" *LQHE*, 171 (1946), 214-21.
112. See note 90.
113. Lindström, Harold. *Wesley and Sanctification*. Stockholm Nya Bokförlags Aktiebolaget, 1946, 228 p.
114. Sangster, William E. *The Path to Perfection*. London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1943, 211 p.; Nashville: Abingdon-Cokesbury Press, 1943, 214 p.
115. Turner, George A. *The More Excellent Way: the Scriptural Basis of the Wesleyan Message*. Winona Lake, Ind.: Life and Light Press, 1952, 292 p. This was originally a Harvard dissertation.
116. Hagen, O. *Litt om Wesleys lære om kristelig fullkommenhet*. Oslo: Metodiamen, 1938.
117. Nuelson, John L. *Die Ordination in Methodismus*. Bremen: , 1935, 191 p.
118. Thompson, Edgar W. *Wesley, Apostolic Man: Some Reflections on Wesley's Consecration of Dr. Thomas Coke*. London: Epworth Press, 1957, 84 p.
119. Sanders, Paul S. "An Appraisal of John Wesley's Sacramentalism in the Evolution of Early American Methodism." New York: Union Theological Seminary, 1954. Dissertation.
120. Sanders, Paul S. "John Wesley and Baptismal Regeneration" *RnL*, XXIII (1953-54), 591-603.

F. Other Methodist Leaders

121. Wiseman, Frederick L. *Charles Wesley*. New York: The Abingdon Press, 1932, 231 p.
122. Baker, Frank. *Charles Wesley as Revealed by His Letters*. London: Epworth Press, 1948, 152 p.
123. Flint, Charles W. *Charles Wesley and His Colleagues*. Washington: Public Affairs Press, 1957, 221 p.
124. *LQHE*, 182 (1957), pp. 241-91.

125. Lloyd, A. Kingsley. "Charles Wesley's Debt to Matthew Henry" *LQHR*, 171 (1946), 330-37.
126. Belden, Albert D. *George Whitefield*. New York: Macmillan, 1953, 302 p.
127. Henry, Stuart C. *George Whitefield, Wayfaring Witness*. New York: Abingdon Press, 1947, 224 p.
128. Aldridge, A. O. "George Whitefield's Georgia Controversies" *Journal of Southern History*, IX (1943), 357-80.
129. Davey, Cyril J. *The Man Who Wanted the World*. London: Cargate Press, 1947, 126 p.
130. Davey, Cyril J. "Significance of Thomas Coke" *LQHR*, 172 (1947), 212-18.
131. Smith, Warren T. "Thomas Coke and Early American Methodism" Boston: Boston University, 1953, Dissertation. Madison: Microcard Foundation, 1953.
132. Leary, William. "John Cennick, 1718-55: A Bi-centenary Appreciation" *WHSProc.*, XXX (1955-56), 30-37.
133. Baker, Frank. "John Cennick: A Handlist of His Writings" *WHSProc.*, XXX (1955-56), 40-44, 50-58, 86-89, 104-07.
134. Told, Silas. *The Life of Mr. Silas Told, Written by Himself*. London: Epworth Press, 1954, 118 p.
135. Rupp, E. Gordon. *Thomas Jackson, Methodist Patriarch*. London: Epworth Press, 1954, 54 p.
136. Wilkinson, John T. *William Clowes, 1780-1851*. London: Epworth Press, 1951, 104 p.
137. Wilkinson, John T. *Hugh Bourne, 1772-1852*. London: Epworth Press, 1952, 203 p.
138. Wilkinson, John T. "Hugh Bourne, 1772-1852: A Centenary Tribute" *WHSProc.*, XXVIII (1951-52), 126-30.
139. *LQHR*, 177 (1952), 161-84.
140. Farndale, W. E. "Hugh Bourne and the Spiritual Manifestation" *WHSProc.*, XXVIII (1951-52), 131-37.
141. Farndale, William E. *The Secret of Mow Cop; a New Appraisal of the Origins of Primitive Methodism*. London: Epworth Press, 1950, 76 p.
142. Davies, Rupert E. (ed.). *John Scott Lidgett*. London: Epworth Press, 1957, 212 p.
- G. Special Aspects of Methodism
143. Church, Leslie F. *The Early Methodist People*. New York: Philosophical Library, 1949, 286 p.
144. Church, Leslie F. *More About the Early Methodist People*. London: Epworth Press, [1949], 324 p.
145. Mammel, Hermann. "Die Laienmitarbeit in der Methodistenkirche als Vorbild für eine kommende Deutsch-evangelische Volkskirche" Bonn: University of Bonn, 1936. Dissertation.
146. Funk, Theophil. *Die Anfänge der Laienmitarbeit im Methodismus*. Bremen: 1941, 255 p.
147. Garrison, Archibald H. W. *The Separation of Methodism from the Church of England*. London: Epworth Press, 1945, 66 p.
148. Sparrow-Simpson, William J. *John Wesley and The Church of England*. London: Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge, 1934.
149. Thompson, Edgar W. *Apostolic Man*. London: Epworth Press, 1957, 84 p.
150. Whitney, Arthur P. *The Basis of Opposition to Methodism in England in the Eighteenth Century*. New York: New York University, 1951, 77 p.
151. Shepherd, T. B. "George Crabbe and Methodism" *LQHR*, 166 (1941), 166-74.
152. Edwards, R. A. "Needless Schism: A Comment on the Bicentenary of Wesley's Conversion" *Hibbert Journal*, XXXVI (1938), 545-56.
153. Methodist comment by A. W. Harrison, *ibid.*, XXXVII (1938), 151-55.
154. Gill, Frederick C. *The Romantic Movement and Methodism*. London: Epworth Press, 1937, 189 p.
155. Shepherd, Thomas B. *Methodism and the Literature of the Eighteenth Century*. London: Epworth Press, 1940, 286 p.
156. Harvey, F. Brompton. "Methodism and the Romantic Movement" *LQHR*, 159 (1934), 289-302.
157. Towson, Clifford W. *Moravian and Methodist*. London: Epworth Press, 1957, 265 p.
158. Baker, Frank. "The Relations between the Society of Friends and Early Methodism" *LQHR*, 173 (1948), 312-23; 174 (1949), 239-48.
159. Bowmer, John C. "The Relations between the Society of Friends and Early Methodism" *LQHR*, 175 (1950), 148-53, 222-27; "Early Methodism and the Quakers" *EnL*, XXIII (1953-54), 418-29.
160. Mumford, Norman W. "The Organization of the Methodist Church in the Time of John Wesley" *LQHR*, 171 (1946), 35-40, 128-35.
161. Norwood, Frederick A. *Church Membership in the Methodist Tradition*. Nashville: The Methodist Publishing House, 1958, 141 p.
162. Russell, Bernard C. "The Theory and Practice of Christian Discipline According to John Wesley: Its Theological Basis and Its Modern Relevance" Madison, New Jersey: Drew University, 1951. Dissertation.
163. Wearmouth, Robert F. "The First Methodist Conference—June 25-30, 1744" *LQHR*, 169 (1944), 205-10.

164. Hunter, Frederick. "The Origin of the Methodist Quarterly Meeting" *LQHE*, 174 (1949), 28-37.
165. Church, Leslie F. "The Call to Preach in Early Methodism" *LQHE*, 179 (1954), 185-91.
166. Coomer, Duncan. "The Local Preachers in Early Methodism" *WHSProc.*, XXV (1945-46), 33-42.
167. Baker, Frank. "Thomas Maxfield's First Sermon" *WHSPros.*, XXVII (1949-50), 7-15.
168. Swift, Wesley F. "The Women Itinerant Preachers of Early Methodism" *WHSProc.*, XXVIII (1951-52), 89-94; XXIX (1953-54), 76-83; XXX (1955-56), 182-84.
169. *The Nature of the Christian Church, According to the Teaching of the Methodists*. London: Methodist Publishing House, 1937, 40 p.
170. Thompson, Edgar W. *The Methodist Doctrine of the Church*. London: Epworth Press, 1939.
171. Thompson, Edgar W. *The Methodist Principles of Church Order*. London: Epworth Press, 1954, 15 p.
172. Body, Alfred H. *John Wesley and Education*. London: Epworth Press, 1936, 168 p.
173. Mathews, Horace F. *Methodism and the Education of the People, 1791-1851*. London: Epworth Press, 1949, 215 p.
174. Edgar, Frederick R. "A Study of John Wesley from the Point of View of the Educational Methodology Used by Him . . ." New York: Columbia University, 1952. Dissertation.
175. Baker, Frank. "Methodism and the '45 Rebellion" *LQHE*, 172 (1947) 325-33.
176. Baker, Frank. "The Erskines and the Methodists" *LQHE*, 183 (1958), 37-45.
177. Belshaw, Harry. "Eighteenth-Century Wit and Methodism" *LQHR*, 156 (1931), 50-60.
178. Moore, Richard D. *Methodism in the Channel Islands*. London: Epworth Press, 1952, 175 p.
- H. Social and Political
179. Warner, Wellman J. *The Wesleyan Movement in the Industrial Revolution*. London; New York: Longmans, Green and Company, 1930, 299 p.
180. Sommer, J. W. Ernst. *John Wesley und die Soziale Frage*. München: Acker-Verlag, 1930, 51 p.
181. Bready, J. Wesley. *England: Before and After Wesley*. New York and London: Harper Brothers, 1938, 463 p.
182. Edwards, Maldwyn. *John Wesley and the Eighteenth Century*. New York: Abingdon Press, 1933, 220 p. Rev. ed., London: Epworth Press, 1955, 207 p.
183. Edwards, Maldwyn. *After Wesley*. London: Epworth Press, 1948, 191 p.
184. Edwards, Maldwyn. *Methodism and England; A Study of Methodism in Its Social and Political Aspects During the Period 1850-1932*. London: Epworth Press, 1944, 252 p.
185. Taylor, Ernest R. *Methodism and Politics, 1791-1851*. Cambridge, England: The University Press, 1935, 226 p.
186. Wearmouth, Robert F. *Methodism and the Common People of the Eighteenth Century*. London: Epworth Press, 1945, 276 p.
187. Wearmouth, Robert F. *Methodism and the Working-Class Movements of England, 1800-1850*. London: Epworth Press, 1937, 289 p.
188. Wearmouth, Robert F. *Methodism and the Struggle of the Working Classes, 1850-1900*. Leicester, England: E. Backus, 1954, 269 p.
189. Wearmouth, Robert F. *The Social and Political Influence of Methodism in the Twentieth Century*. London: Epworth Press, 1957, 265 p.
190. MacArthur, Kathleen W. *The Economic Ethics of John Wesley*. New York: The Abingdon Press, 1936, 166 p.
191. Kingdon, Robert M. "Laissez-faire or Government Control: A Problem for John Wesley" *Church History*, XXVI (1957), 342-54.
192. Collingwood, Peter J. "Prison Visitation in the Methodist Revival" *LQHE*, 180 (1955), 285-92.
193. Hodgen, M. T. "The Negro in the Anthropology of John Wesley" *Journal of Negro History*, XIX (1934), 308-23.
- I. Worship
194. Bishop, John. *Methodist Worship*. London: Epworth Press, 1950, 164 p.
195. French, W. Maynard. *The John Wesley Prayer Book*. Nashville: Parthenon Press, 1956, 133 p.
196. Swift, Wesley F. "Methodism and the Book of Common Prayer" *WHSProc.*, XXVII (1949-50), 33-41.
197. Swift, Wesley F. "The Sunday Service of the Methodists" *WHSProc.*, XXIX (1953-54), 12-20.
198. Hunter, Frederick. "Sources of Wesley's Revision of the Prayer Book in 1784-8" *WHSProc.*, XXIII (1941-2), 123-33.
199. Gill, Frederick C., ed. *John Wesley's Prayers*. London: Epworth Press, 1951, 124 p.
200. *The Wesley Orders of Common Prayer*. Nashville: National Methodist Student Movement, 1957, 106 p. Introduction by E. C. Gibbs.
201. Sanders, Paul S. "An Appraisal of John Wesley's Sacramentalism in the Evolution of Early American Methodism." New York: Union Theological Seminary, 1954. Dissertation.

202. Bett, Henry. *The Hymns of Methodism*. London: Epworth Press, 1945, 172 p.
203. Findlay, George H. *Christ's Standard Bearer: A Study in the Hymns of Charles Wesley*. London: Epworth Press, 1956.
204. Flew, R. Newton. *The Hymns of Charles Wesley: A Study of their Structure*. London: Epworth Press, 1953.
205. Manning, Bernard L. *The Hymns of Wesley and Watts*. London: Epworth Press, 1948, 143 p.
206. Manning, Bernard L. "Hymns for the Use of the People Called Methodists" *LQHE*, 158 (1933), 309-332; "The Recall to Religion in the Hymns of Charles Wesley" *LQHE*, 163 (1938), 475-491; "Wesley's Hymns Reconsidered" *LQHE*, 165 (1940), 19-30, 154-65.
207. Stevenson, R. "John Wesley's First Hymnbook" *Review of Religion*, XIV (1950), 140-60.
208. Stevenson, Robert M. *Patterns of Protestant Church Music*. Durham: Duke University Press, 1953, 219 p.
209. Nuelson, John L. *John Wesley und das deutsche Kirchenlied*. Bremen und Zürich: 1938, 222 p.
210. Bett, Henry. "John Wesley's Translations of German Hymns" *LQHE*, 165 (1940), 288-94.
211. Beckerlegge, Oliver A. "John Wesley and the German Hymns" *LQHE*, 165 (1940), 430-39.
212. Wesley, Charles. *Fifty Hymns of Charles Wesley*. London: Epworth Press, 1957, 69 p.
213. Kay, J. Alan. *Wesley's Prayers and Praises*. London: Epworth Press, 1958, 193 p.
214. Hildebrandt, Franz. *Wesley Hymn Book*. London: 1958. Privately printed for compiler, Drew University, Madison, N. J.
215. Lightwood, James T. *The Music of the Methodist Hymn-Book*. London: Epworth Press, 1955, 572 p.
216. Mumford, Norman W. "The Administration of the Sacrament of Baptism in The Methodist Church" *LQHE*, 172 (1947), 113-19.
217. Bowmer, John C. *The Sacrament of the Lord's Supper in Early Methodism*. Westminster: Dacre Press, 1951, 244 p. See also Mumford, Norman W. "The Administration of the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper in the Methodist Church after the Death of John Wesley" *LQHE*, 176 (1951), 61-70.
218. Bowmer, John C. "Wesley's Revision of the Communion Service in 'The Sunday Service of the Methodists'" *LQHE*, 176 (1951), 230-37; "The History of Holy Communion in Methodism," *LQHE*, 184 (1959), 97-102.
219. Rupp, E. Gordon. "The Holy Communion in the Methodist Church," in H. Martin, ed. *The Holy Communion: A Symposium*. London: SCM Press, 1947.
220. Hunter, Frederick. "The Origins of Wesley's Covenant Service" *LQHE*, 164 (1939), 78-87.
221. Baker, Frank. "The Beginnings of the Methodist Covenant Service" *LQHE*, 180 (1955), 215-20.
222. Baker, Frank. *Methodism and the Love-Feast*. London: Epworth Press, 1957, 83 p.
223. Sanders, Paul S. Series of four articles in *The Pastor*, XVII (1954, Jan.-Apr.), on Liturgy, and the three articles in *ibid.*, XI (1948, Mar., May, June), on the Sunday Service.
- J. Nineteenth and Twentieth Centuries*
224. Edwards, Maldwyn. "The Years of Unrest: 1790-1800" *LQHE*, 166 (1941), 451-58; 167 (1942), 84-93.
225. Crosby, Bernard. "Methodist Evangelism, 1800-1820" *LQHE*, 169 (1944), 289-305.
226. Kent, John. *Jabez Bunting, the Last Wesleyan*. London: Epworth Press, 1955, 62 p.
227. Dunlap, Elden Dale. "Methodist Theology in Great Britain in the Nineteenth Century, with special reference to the Theology of Adam Clarke, Richard Watson, and William Burt Pope" New Haven: Yale University, 1956. Dissertation.
228. Pilkington, F. "Methodism in Arnold Bennett's Novels" *Contemporary Review*, 189 (1956), 109-15.
229. Wycheley, Richard Newman. *The Pageant of Methodist Union*. London: Epworth Press, 1936, 411 p.
230. The Methodist Church (England). *The Constitutional Practice and Discipline of The Methodist Church*. London: Methodist Publishing House, 1953, 360 p. Ed. by Harold Spencer and Edwin Finch.
231. Beckerlegge, Oliver A. *The United Methodist Free Churches*. London: Epworth Press, 1957, 112 p.

SURVEY
THE HISTORIOGRAPHY OF MORMONISM
MARVIN S. HILL

Perhaps no American denomination stirred greater enmity during the century following 1830 than the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints—the Mormons. An hostility promoted by recurrent conflict between Saint and Gentile has generally divided historians into two distinct groups, forging a cleavage in sentiment which is evident in the debates over the origin of the Book of Mormon, the treatment given Joseph Smith and the Utah church, and in the surveys of the total Mormon movement and the place of the Saints in American secular and religious life.

I

An issue of primary importance is the nature of that unique American scripture, the Book of Mormon. Acclaimed by the faithful as a sacred history of a Christian people in ancient America, the book has been labelled a fraud by non-believers. Bernard DeVoto recognized the fundamental character of this controversy when he said "it is inseparable from one's explanation of Joseph Smith." Both sides have shown some intransigence on the subject by refusing to consider the claims of the opposition.¹ This dual rigidity seems a consequence of differing faiths, the Mormon conviction resting on the notion that God arbitrarily changed the course of events to bring the book into being, that of the non-Mormon on the assumption that human history must be interpreted as a result of more predictable forces.

The case for the Latter-day Saints has been stated often,² but with no greater sophistication than that exhibited by Hugh Nibley of Brigham Young University in his *Approach to the Book of Mormon* (1957). He reviews the culture of the ancient Near East to find that in theme, the details

of its narrative, and its use of place and proper names the Book of Mormon is authentic. He states that the marks of genuine antiquity in the record could not have been imitated by anyone in 1830. However intimate his knowledge of ancient history may be, certain difficulties exist in his argument. He cites many phenomena which seem as much American as they do ancient,³ and exaggerates the significance of details which are hazy or all but lacking.⁴ Invariably he handles his topic in an authoritarian fashion, never indicating that some points may be open to question.

The non-Mormon interpretations separate into those which argue that Smith was the sole author and those which affirm that he had help from Sidney Rigdon, the early Campbellite preacher. Alexander Campbell himself was the first to urge the former view. In 1831 his editorial "Delusions"⁵ stamped the book as "a worthless fabrication" which collected "every error and almost every truth discussed in New York in the last ten years." No other writer took a similar stand until 1902 when I. Woodridge Riley wrote *The Founder of Mormonism* to insist that Smith's "hallucinations" were the result of epilepsy.

In 1917 Walter F. Prince reopened the argument in "Psychological Tests for the Authorship of the Book of Mormon"⁶ by suggesting that Smith refashioned certain emotion-packed words current in his environment, along with some of his family names, to form the proper names used in the scripture. Prince points to the frequency with which syllables like "mor" and "anti" occur (which seem to reflect the anti-Masonic hysteria) and cites the similarity between the proper names and those of Smith's close relatives.

His thesis was promptly attacked with some cogency by Theodore Schroeder, whose "Authorship of the Book of Mormon"⁷ demonstrates that Prince's reasoning is circuitous. To test his hypothesis adequately Prince should have studied the Prophet's known writings to identify the peculiar word combinations, then gone to the Book of Mormon in search of final proof. Instead he started with the Golden Bible and went no further. Schroeder saw that Prince selected his evidence too carefully; he did not notice how Prince arranged his statistics to count a few names (like Mormon) several times.⁸ In addition he overlooked the fact that since Prince searched through a mass of New York records covering a decade it would be unusual if he did not find an incident which highlighted names similar to those in the Mormon Bible. Prince's challenge to the reader to test the theory by using his own family names has proved inconclusive. Various combinations of the names in my family—like Hill, Emma, Marvin, Henry, Ann and Donna—resemble Book of Mormon names like Helaman, Amah, Mahonri and Anti as closely as do those isolated by Prince.⁹ Perhaps the truth of his thesis may require further demonstration.

The most plausible exposition of the Smith hypothesis was made by Fawn Brodie, author of *No Man Knows My History*. (1946) As she explains it, Smith employed a fertile imagination and an unusual responsiveness to his environment to magnify the theme of Ethan Smith's *View of the Hebrews*, a book which identifies the American Indians as the Lost Tribes of Israel. Brodie stresses that both books describe the deterioration of an Israelite civilization in America, mention a written record of the aborigines once buried in the earth, and sponsor missionary effort to convert the Indians. She points also to the fact that *View of the Hebrews* cites Ezekiel chapter thirty-seven in a manner suggestive of the Mormon use to vindicate their sacred book, and shows

that Joseph knew of the work since he quoted it in his newspaper in 1842. Some additional parallels seem superficial. She states that both books quoted "copiously and almost exclusively" from Isaiah. Actually they both cite a number of Old Testament books.¹⁰ It is true, as she indicates, that both works open with a mention of the destruction of Jerusalem but the fact is not especially significant. The Book of Mormon refers to the Babylonian conquest while Ethan Smith's work discusses that of the Romans.¹¹

The theory of a Rigdon-Smith conspiracy was introduced in 1834 by E. D. Howe in *Mormonism Unveiled*. Howe published affidavits by the relatives of writer Solomon Spaulding to the effect that a Spaulding romance about pre-Columbian America was identical to the narrative portions of the Book of Mormon. To explain this likeness Howe states that Sidney Rigdon secured the Spaulding novel in Pittsburgh and after adding the religious material induced Smith to present it to the public as ancient scripture.

Many students adopted Howe's interpretation; it was not seriously challenged until Riley reevaluated it as part of his study. William Linn's *Story of the Mormons* (1902) gave twenty-seven pages to its support, and in 1932 George Arbaugh in *Revelation in Mormonism* sought to identify what parts of the Book of Mormon had come from the Spaulding novel despite the fact that he had only the recollection of Howe's witnesses to provide him knowledge of its contents.

The conspiracy theory was partly undermined by Daryl Chase in a master's thesis, "Sidney Rigdon, Early Mormon."¹² Chase accounted for enough of Rigdon's time during the years previous to the printing of the Book of Mormon to make his involvement unlikely. DeVoto in *Forays and Rebuttals* (1936) said it is inconceivable that a man as prominent as Rigdon would permit Smith to take credit for the book and then allow him to dominate their relationship afterward. He made another point when

he noted that the only Spaulding manuscript ever located had little resemblance to the Golden Bible. Brodie dealt the theory a crushing blow by casting suspicion on the validity of testimony given years afterward by witnesses whose statements seem too much alike to be trustworthy.

From one viewpoint the study of the Book has not greatly advanced since 1834. By that time the Mormon position had been declared, and Alexander Campbell and E. D. Howe had developed the Gentile versions. The subsequent debate has convinced no one otherwise minded, and has obscured the value of the scripture as a sampling of the Mormon mind in its early stages.

II

If the Book of Mormon has proved a subject of disagreement so has the Mormon Prophet. The most conservative Mormon writers have adhered closely to church dogma in their exposition. George Q. Cannon's *Life of Joseph Smith* (1888) is closer to poetry than to history, describing fervently the doings of "men of God . . . pure and holy." Smith is exaggerated in relationship to his co-workers, being depicted "in simplicity" as the "oracle of the almighty to the nations." The "paltry things," or unfavorable facts, are omitted.¹³ Cannon wrote while serving a prison term for polygamy, yet he made an honest effort to collect what material was available. He simply lacked the frame of mind to exercise any critical judgment,¹⁴ over-idealizing the early years of the church which were the years of his youth. The myth that he constructed has carried through much of the denomination's literature.

Chase's study of Rigdon is more scholarly. However, it is noteworthy that although he discounts the Spaulding theory Chase offers no alternative explanation. He argues, in keeping with his religious beliefs, that much of the basic doctrine was formulated by Smith before Rigdon's conversion and while this may be so his evidence is no longer adequate.¹⁵

Whereas Fawn Brodie, a Mormon of liberal views, is indistinguishable from a non-Mormon in her attitude toward the Book of Mormon, she reflects in her scrutinization of the Prophet's life qualities which may stem from her Mormon background. Her biography is the product of the most rigorous research yet done on the Mormon leader. It establishes Smith as a man of talent and argues well that he indeed was the originator of Mormonism. But the book is somewhat marred by a number of minor errors of fact and by a tendency to rely on the unsupported assertions of the embittered Mormon apostates to add detail to the narrative.¹⁶ The biting irony of style is perhaps the product of the author's personal disillusionment.¹⁷

The apostates from the church have dealt harshly with Joseph Smith and the Saints. One of the most notorious of these, John C. Bennett, a former mayor of Nauvoo, informs us in his *History of the Saints: An exposé of Joe Smith and Mormonism* (1842) that he only joined the sect to reveal its scheme for rebellion. He denounces plural marriage practices in Nauvoo while carefully obscuring his own involvement. Some of his factual details are accurate, as Brodie has shown,¹⁸ but the book is generally of low caliber.

Two treatises by non-Mormons written during the same period are similarly marked by antipathy toward the Saints. The Reverend Henry Caswall thought his *Prophet of the Nineteenth Century* (1843) would prove instructive to "those who aim at the propagation of truth or the extirpation of falsehood." It is interesting to observe that his general interpretation is not unlike that later developed by Brodie. "An original cunning led to deceitful measures for . . . money." These led to "spiritual power, and . . . ambition. Ambition . . . ultimately produced . . . projects of the most unbounded conquest and spoliation."¹⁹ Samuel Smucker composed a "complete and impartial" *Religious, Social and Political History of the Mormons*

(1856). On occasion he uses Mormon sources, and includes some eye witness accounts to flavor his narrative. He perceives in Saint doctrine "sufficient of the old to attract those who would reject anything entirely new but enough of the new to rivet the attention and inflame the imagination." Smucker sees Joseph as a "religious impostor, or a maniac," but one who possessed both courage and ability, even "rude genius."

The Mormon people sojourned in four different states during the first fourteen years of their history and in each they experienced conflict with the first settlers. Two Illinois writers display a customary hostility. Ex-governor Thomas Ford produced his *History of Illinois* eight years after the Mormon departure but these intervening years did not alter his opinion that the Saints were stupid and their Prophet a tyrant. His work gives valuable insight into the attitude of the Illinoisans. Based on personal recollection, it vividly recounts how the fear of Mormonism increased in the minds of the older residents, and how swiftly spreading rumors prepared the way for the Smith murder. Ford relates that the greatest cause of alarm was the Mormon unity and power in politics. He affords us a glimpse of the problem which a closely knit, rigid people could present to a state when they were unwilling to mix with the rest of citizenry.

The increased animosity in Thomas Gregg's *History of Hancock County* (1880) may be due to the fact that Gregg lived in the locality where most of the difficulty started. He describes Smith as "a rude, foul-mouthed declaimer and blasphemer," and his disciples as "dishonest." He states that the permanent residents feared the implication of the Mormon doctrine of the temporal kingdom, viewing it as exclusive and a "menace." He grimly warns that "no people outside of 'Zion' can be expected to relish it."

If recent non-Mormon students have been more scholarly in their research of the first years of Mormonism they have not always displayed great-

er detachment. A native of Illinois, George Arbaugh, affirms in his analysis of Saint revelation that it is time for the movement's origins to be made clear, for the present-day tendency toward expansion "makes such knowledge essential."²⁰ In his second chapter he accepts the Spaulding theory without considering the work of Daryl Chase. His chapters on the Doctrine and Covenants are more thorough. He illustrates with deftness that contradictions existed in a number of the Saint revelations, that some prophecies were unfulfilled, and that on occasion Smith altered the Mormon scripture to suit his purpose.²¹ But Arbaugh divorces the revelations from their context and thereby makes the leaders seem ridiculous and the people overly credulous.²² He demands consistency from the Mormon God and when he finds it lacking he considered his point made,²³ without indicating how the imperatives were instrumental in the formation of the new church.

Whitney Cross's *Burned-Over District* (1950) provides too brief a commentary on the Mormon mind but an intensive consideration of the cultural milieu from which Mormonism emerged. Cross has convincingly demonstrated that neither the Saints nor their movement were products of the frontier. It may be that this insight will encourage further inquiries into the origin of the sect.

III

Church official Milton R. Hunter's *Mormons and the American Frontier* (1940), a text on the Utah period, treats an interesting subject but lacks scholarship since non-Mormon sources are used only where they fit Saint convictions. No effort is made to encourage independent thought.

Of more substance are the scholarly studies by men with conservative views. Hunter's Ph.D. dissertation, *Brigham Young the Colonizer* (1940), is the most exhaustive work on this topic. It considers the personnel of colonization, the methods of land set-

tlement, the industries established, and outlines the activities of colonization in each of the valleys of the Great Basin and along the "Mormon Corridor."²⁴ Leland Creer in *Utah and the Nation* (1929) ably catalogues the relations of the Mormons with the federal government between 1846 and 1869. Like the others in this class it is well documented and informative but lacks breadth of view. It is descriptive rather than analytical, provincial in implication rather than national.

The more liberal literature combines scholarship with interpretation. Nels Anderson's *Desert Saints* (1940) offers many incisive comments upon Mormon society on the frontier and handles the controversial aspects moderately. Juanita Brooks in *Mountain Meadows Massacre* (1950) places the responsibility for this tragedy squarely on the Mormons of southern Utah and indirectly on certain leaders at Salt Lake. She makes it clear that the affair was the product of a war hysteria which afterward gave the churchmen cause for remorse.

Kimball Young's *Isn't One Wife Enough?* (1954) furnishes a history of polygamy to 1890, and an analysis of the family relationships of one-hundred seventy-five polygamists. Included in the historical section is a sketch of the anti-polygamy campaign during the 1870's and 1880's, and an interesting evaluation of the "do-gooder" psychology which prompted the Gentile assault. At times sociologist Young, a descendent of Brigham, handles Joseph Smith harshly while his robust ancestor receives circumspect treatment.²⁵

The Great Basin Kingdom (1958) by Leonard Arrington is an economic history based on vast research. It illustrates the flexibility of Saint institutions in the face of continual difficulty. What stands out, as Arrington says, is that the church held so long to its economic program. We could learn more about the ideals which sponsored such tenacity. The massive notes and bibliography are invaluable. A work of less import is Ray West's *Kingdom*

of the Saints (1957) which combines the virtues of able narrative and some pungent remarks on the limitations of preceding studies but lends little information or interpretation to what has been written on the Utah period.

Apostate Ann Eliza Young's *Wife No. 19* (1875) is a campaign volume intending "to impress upon the world what Mormonism really is" and to stir interest "that shall deepen into indignation." For this purpose she depicts the Mormon women as abused but courageously resigned to their fate. The villains of her melodrama are the church leaders, especially Brigham who had not provided his ex-wife with the style of living she expected. Accordingly, she laments his irreligion, lack of affection for children, and criminal inclinations. When she is not characterizing polygamy or the Mormon leaders she often relates the facts with accuracy, but fact is mixed with fiction on many of her pages.

Another wayward Saint, T. B. H. Stenhouse, wrote his *Rocky Mountain Saints* (1873) partly as an exposé but also as a missionary tract advocating his kind of Mormonism. As a leader of the "New Movement," a revolt against the provincial economic and religious policies of Young, Stenhouse sought to encourage greater independence of spirit among the Mormons. He foresaw disaster awaiting the church due to its "crowning error" of priesthood infallibility. He wanted accommodation to the rising Gentile pressure but his attitudes were too liberal for his day.

Exposés by non-Mormons continued their appearance as late as 1926, and were often the work of ministers of other faiths. Reverend C. P. Lyford's *Mormon Problem* (1886) warns that Mormonism constitutes a threat to American liberties. Rollen Harth's "The Mormons" (1900) informs *Atlantic Monthly* readers that the sect "stands for treason and crime sanctioned by fabricated 'revelations.'" In 1920 Sheridan Jones wrote *The Truth about the Mormons* to curb Saint proselyting by demonstrating that "Utah is polygamous." James Snow-

den's *Truth about Mormonism* (1926), although more erudite, seeks to "oppose any errors . . . [it] embodies."

Joseph Dwyer (a Roman Catholic priest) made use of a number of government records to argue in *Gentile Comes to Utah* (1941) that the first steps in Mormon accommodation were a response to the agitation of Utah's Gentiles. M. R. Werner's *Brigham Young* (1925) catches much of the vitality of the Mormon Moses but exaggerates his role in the early preservation of the church. Werner rightly sees polygamy as an accretion to Puritan moral values. His balanced portrayal of Young may be partly due to his "principle" for the selection of material—"uniting defects admitted by his admirers and those virtues admitted by his enemies."

Richard T. Ely's "Economic Aspects of Mormonism"²⁶ pioneered many fields mined by later historians. Studies of the Mormon village, the United Order, irrigation and the co-operatives were foreshadowed.²⁷ Fifteen years passed before Hamilton Gardner first developed an Ely theme by reviewing "Cooperation Among the Mormons" and "Communism Among the Mormons" in the *Quarterly Journal of Economics*.²⁸

IV

Certain historians have treated the sweep of Mormon history to 1900, while others have attempted a broad interpretation of its meaning. A work in the former class is the six volume *Comprehensive History of the Church* (1930) by the church leader, B. H. Roberts. This is a massive polemic, but where it seems impossible to justify Saint conduct Roberts admits as much. His volumes form a useful affirmation of some traditional Mormon attitudes on controversial issues.

William Linn wrote his *Story of the Mormons* at the turn of the century when the progressive spirit called for the divulgence of the secret sins of a variety of American institutions. He combines crusading enthusiasm with some thorough research to produce a

survey that can still be helpful. He exerts great effort to prove the Book of Mormon fraudulent in the expectation that once established "the whole church scheme crumbles." But his reforming zeal misfires when he uses the beliefs of certain elders rather than the book itself to show its similarity to the doctrines of Rigdon. He misjudged the temper of the Saints of his day when he said "they would dominate the nation." By that time Mormon militancy had waned.

The Mormon writer Ephraim Erickson in considering *The Psychological and Ethical Aspects of Mormon Group Life* (1922) found that many Saint values were molded during the periodic crises that they faced. Conflict with the Gentiles during Smith's regime reenforced both their solidarity and their vagaries. In Utah the institutions had to be readapted to the desert frontier and in the doing priesthood control was increased. Present-day ideological differences between the old and new generations could perhaps be resolved by directing attention toward new external problems.

Another imaginative Mormon, William Mulder, has written several articles in various scholarly journals²⁹ focusing on the gathering, Mormonism's "oldest and most influential doctrine." His viewpoint is partially spelled out in *Homeward to Zion* (1957) which treats the fortunes of the Mormon emigrants from Scandinavia. The student should not neglect *Among the Mormons* (1958), his lively collection of source materials which is welded together by some informative comments.

Utah-born Bernard DeVoto wrote two scathing articles on the Saints during the 1930's. In "Centennial of Mormonism"³⁰ he describes the doctrine as an identification of God's grace with money making, adding that "piety and business could be completely fused only by means of a creed too ridiculous for any widespread acceptance." By 1936 DeVoto's anger had mellowed somewhat and his essay in *Forays and Rebuttals* is more dis-

creet. He finds that the church only identified itself with American business after the death of Brigham Young, during the years from 1890 to 1907.

In a neglected piece in the *New England Quarterly* David Brion Davis points to "The New England Origins of Mormonism" (1953). He makes the most of some limited research to characterize the sect as essentially seventeenth century in outlook. He ties Mormon literal-mindedness, their appeal to reason rather than emotion, and their belief in providential history to a Puritan background, and sees the first Saints as cast-offs of the Half-Way Covenant. His characterization of the Mormon commonwealth as a rigorous reaction against the breakdown of the Puritan synthesis is an ingenious insight, but somewhat misleading should historians not recognize as well that the movement drew its moral force more directly from the Protestant "Counter Reformation." Thus the Saints' quest for a religiously oriented society, their biblical millennialism, missionary fervor, and desire for church unity were a variation upon the ideals and program activated during the campaign against indifference and infidelity.

Thomas F. O'Dea's *The Mormons* (1957) represents the most mature approach to the troublesome problem of the Saints, their history and institutions that a non-Mormon has produced. He isolates five historical trends out of which Mormonism emerged—sectarianism, ecumenism, communism, the ideal of human freedom, and secular optimism. His careful analysis of the Book of Mormon calls attention to the hope and exaltation of the American revivals there enshrined. He describes the Mormon creed as a conciliation of nineteenth century ideas that possessed a "cohesiveness of tendency and congruity of fundamental principle which rendered it a unified point of view." While O'Dea has admirably depicted the beliefs and attitudes of the more thoughtful Saints, he has not considered the influence

of folklore on the masses. An informative description of this aspect of Mormonism is Austin and Alta Fife's *Saints of Sage and Saddle* (1956), the value of which is limited by the fact that it does not comment on the role of the folklore it so interestingly reproduces.

V

The Latter-day Saints have merited a place in secular history largely because of their successful community building and this has led historians to emphasize that feature. In *Slavery and Abolition* (1907) Albert Bushnell Hart views them as an "obscure sect" which has proved a "standout among American socialistic communities." Edward Channing while portraying *The Period of Transition 1815-48* (1926) gives an uneven account of Mormon institutions, with his most lengthy discussion treating the function of the "ward" or local parish. The Beards' *Rise of American Civilization* (1927) accents the economic achievements, while Commager in his *American Mind* (1950) sees the church as "authoritative, centralized, regimented, efficient," with a "secular appeal."

The students of American religion have usually been less judicious. The nineteenth century Protestant writers found little to praise in Mormonism and were reluctant to include it within the scope of Christianity. Robert Baird in *Religion in America* (1856) remarks that "Jews, Shakers, Mormons, etc.—ought to be called non-Christian . . . and take rank with Deists and other infidels." He declares that "modern times furnish few more remarkable examples of cunning in the leaders, and delusion in their dupes, than are presented by what is called Mormonism." In 1890 Daniel Dorchester studying *Christianity in the United States* judged the system "a state . . . controlled by a power claiming an infallibility unequaled by the Pope of Rome." Like Baird, Dorchester found

it difficult to categorize the Saints, dealing with them in his early national period, and again while looking at "divergent currents." Leonard Bacon's *History of American Christianity* (1897) brands the sect "a gross, palpable imposture contrived by a disreputable adventurer," and the members a "body of fanatics formidable to the Republic." He finds space to notice them only while discussing immigration.

More circumspect are two recent religious scholars. Charles Braden included the Saints in *These Also Believe*. (1949) He avoids appraisal by telling of the origin and doctrine in Mormon terminology. Sweet's *Story of Religion in America* (1950) recounts the theories of the Book of Mormon's origin without taking sides, and classifies the Saints with the sects which arose during the "restless thirties and forties."

* * * *

It would seem that the historiography of Mormonism has been plagued by too much emotion, too much description and too little interpretation. Most of it has been written from too narrow a base. The greatest bulk has

been confined within bounds more or less set by the church, concerning itself with topics like the origin of the Golden Bible or the validity of Smith's revelations. The efforts to characterize the movement have been too few. Erickson, DeVoto, Mulder, O'Dea and Davis have made the most significant attempts but none fully satisfy. Erickson and DeVoto have offered some useful suggestions but have not presented a broad enough scope. Mulder has outlined an interpretive scheme which appears promising but has not developed its full implications. It may be that he is perceiving Mormon history in its most meaningful context when he deals with a theme basic to American history—immigration—and when he illustrates the form it has taken among the Latter-day Saints. O'Dea has told us much about the typical as well as diverse aspects of the Mormon make-up but has not traced its historical roots sufficiently. David Brion Davis is correct when he emphasizes the New England origins, but his insights must be amplified. It might prove beneficial if historians would look more carefully at the transitions which have occurred since 1900. This period has been ignored too long.

1. See Bernard DeVoto, *Forays and Rebuttals* (Boston: Little, Brown and Company, 1936), p. 91, and Hugh Nibley, *An Approach to the Book of Mormon* (Salt Lake: Deseret News Press, 1957), p. 25.
2. I counted forty-five books and articles written between 1940 and 1953 to defend the Book of Mormon.
3. Nibley, pp. 140, 202-16, 339, 348.
4. He concludes that Lehi was a merchant and bases much of the first part of his argument on this assumption. But there is little concrete evidence to support it. See pp. 38-39 and compare the appropriate citations. He matches the society described in Alma 23 with Qumran (p. 157), but the Book of Mormon lacks sufficient detail for such a comparison.
5. "Delusions," *The Millennial Harbinger*, II (1831), p. 93.
6. Walter Franklin Prince, "Psychological Tests for the Authorship of the Book of Mormon," *The American Journal of Psychology*, XXVIII (July, 1917), 373-89.
7. Theodore Schroeder, "Authorship of the Book of Mormon," *ibid*, XXX (January, 1919), 66-72.
8. Prince, p. 379.
9. *Ibid.*, pp. 380-88. The given names which I have used are those of my immediate family.
10. Ethan Smith, *View of the Hebrews: or the Ten Tribes of Israel in America* (Poultney, Vermont, 1825). In an examination of his second chapter I found that he quotes Isaiah ten times, Ezekiel six, Hosea four, and several other books once or twice. The Book of Mormon (1920 edition) cites Genesis, Jeremiah and Malachi as well as Isaiah. See pp. 10, 36, 446.
11. Compare Ethan Smith's opening chapter with the Book of Mormon, pp. 1-3.
12. Daryl Chase, "Sidney Rigdon, Early Mormon" (Unpublished Master's thesis, University of Chicago, 1932), pp. 57-59.

13. George Q. Cannon, "The Life of Joseph Smith, The Prophet" (Salt Lake: The Juvenile Instructor Office, 1888), p. xxiii.
14. See his fantastic account of one-hundred-fifty Missourians being "put to flight" by twelve Mormons, *ibid.*, p. 249.
15. He uses Joseph's "first vision" to define the early Saint beliefs. Brodie has questioned the authenticity of this manifestation. See Fawn Brodie, *No Man Knows My History* (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1946), pp. 21-25.
16. Admittedly Brodie has corroborated these stories where possible but see pp. 125-26, 147, 183, 196-97, 222.
17. *Ibid.*, see pp. 36-37, 72, 80, 297.
18. *Ibid.*, pp. 434-65.
19. Henry Caswall, *The Prophet of the Nineteenth Century* (London, 1843), pp. 209-10.
20. George Bartholomew Arbaugh, *Revelation in Mormonism* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1932), p. v.
21. *Ibid.*, pp. 69-95.
22. *Ibid.*, pp. 77-78. Contrast this with West's discussion of the Zion's Camp affair. Ray Benedict West, *Kingdom of the Saints* (New York: The Viking Press, 1957), pp. 54-56.
23. *Ibid.*, pp. 88, 90-93.
24. Milton R. Hunter, *Brigham Young the Colonizer* (Salt Lake: Deseret News Press, 1940). His chapter on the Mormon corridor was first published in the *Pacific Historical Review*, VIII (June, 1939), 179-200.
25. Kimball Young, *Isn't One Wife Enough?* (New York: Henry Holt and Company, 1954). Contrast pp. 82, 102, 309-10 with 110 and 331. Professor Young does not mention Brigham in his discussion of the "Reformation" and Mountain Meadows.
26. Richard T. Ely, "Economic Aspects of Mormonism," *Harpers Monthly Magazine*, CVI (April, 1903), 667-78.
27. *Ibid.*, pp. 669-76. Lowry Nelson, Joseph Geddes, Edward Allen and Gardner have published developments of the prominent themes in Ely's piece.
28. Hamilton Gardner, "Cooperation Among the Mormons," *The Quarterly Journal of Economics* XXXI (May, 1917) 461-99 and "Communism Among the Mormons," *ibid.*, XXXVII (November, 1922), 134-74.
29. See "Mormonism's 'Gathering': An American Doctrine with a Difference," *Church History*, XXIII (September, 1954), 248-64; "Immigration and the 'Mormon Question': An International Episode," *The Western Political Quarterly*, IX (June, 1956), 416-33; and "Image of Zion: Mormonism As An American Influence in Scandinavia," *Mississippi Valley Historical Review*, XLIII (June, 1956), 18-38.
30. Bernard DeVoto, "The Centennial of Mormonism," *The American Mercury*, XIX (January, 1930), 1-13.

COMMUNICATION

To the Editors:

I read with interest Thomas E. Jessett's "Christian Missions to the Indians of Oregon" in the June number of *Church History*. As a person who has just finished writing a doctoral dissertation covering that area ("American Churches and American Territorial Expansion, 1830-1850") I was pleased to find someone else who felt it important "to correlate the efforts of the various individuals and denominations involved, in the light of the economic and political situation." The attempt to relate Christian missions to the Indians of Oregon to the worldwide outreach of the Church and white civilization in the nineteenth century also was appreciated, for all too often historians have overlooked the wider scope and have dwelt too much on Oregon missions as a subject in itself.

At the same time, however, I found myself disturbed by several aspects of the article. In addition to factual errors there was also questionable documentation and doubtful interpretation. In light of the discrediting of church historians which followed the critical attacks on the "Whitman Legend," it is important that we adhere to the strictest canons of historical research in presenting the story of Christian missions in Oregon, and it is for this reason that I feel impelled to write.

There are at least two errors of fact that need to be corrected. The first is the citing of 1834 as the year when Jason Lee secured an appropriation of forty thousand dollars from the Methodist Episcopal Church Board of Missions for the extension of that denomination's Oregon missions (p. 150). According to the account of one of the secretaries of the Mission Board four thousand dollars had been appropriated for the missionaries in September and October 1833 and another one thousand dollars was deposited for the use of the mission in October 1835.¹ In the intervening

months Jason Lee had written at least four letters to the Board but there was no indication that he asked for or received a sum of forty thousand dollars although he did request additional missionaries and supplies.² The sum of forty thousand dollars was the amount appropriated for the Oregon mission as a result of Mr. Lee's return trip to the United States in 1838-39, and one of the reasons he remained in the East so long was to engage in a speaking tour to help raise part of that large amount. Thirty thousand dollars was appropriated by the Mission Board late in 1838 and an additional ten thousand was voted in the spring of the next year.³ With this large appropriation Jason Lee was able to secure the personnel and provisions which formed the reinforcements of 1840 to which the article referred.

A second factual error was made when Mr. Jessett concluded that all Protestant missions to Oregon ended with the Whitman massacre in 1847 (p. 155). It is true that Protestant missions to the Indians closed after that event, but all Christian missions to Oregon did not cease at that time. On the contrary, Protestant missions continued to be carried on for the swelling white population coming from the United States. *The Methodist Quarterly Review* for April, 1847, indicated the continuing effort:

. . . The Oregon mission, now embraced in our own territory, has been reduced to three or four missionaries, whose work is not likely to differ greatly from that on our frontier settlements, though it is hoped that a few Indians may yet be gathered by their labors.⁴

The same sentiment was reiterated in the *Annual Report* of the Missionary Society of the Methodist Episcopal Church the next year.⁵ And at the denomination's General Conference in 1848 the mission stations in Oregon were incorporated into a new Oregon and California Mission Conference which became a regular jurisdiction of the Church.⁶ The withdrawal of the

American Board of Commissioners for Foreign Missions after the Whitman massacre was offset by the arrival by June, 1848, of the first missionaries sponsored by the American Home Missionary Society.⁷ Moreover, two Baptist missionaries had started work in Oregon a year earlier.⁸ Thus, while Protestant missions to the Indians ceased after 1847, missions to the white settlers continued and expanded after that date.

What appears to me to be questionable documentation occurred in several places in the Jessett article. It has been my understanding that one cites his sources for information that is not common knowledge and that by checking a person's footnote references one will find the specific original information which a writer presents. Using this criterion, I assumed that I would find the source for Jonathan S. Green's visit to Oregon (p. 148) in *The Missionary Herald*, volume XXIII, pages 396-397, as cited in footnote two. But upon checking that source I found only that a missionary had been assigned to visit Oregon "if practicable" and no mention of Jonathan S. Green or the outcome of his visit. The rest of that citation correctly described the dual goal of sending missionaries and of assisting in planting a Christian colony in Oregon, but it would help scholars if the source of the other data also were given.

At another place (p. 151) Mr. Jessett cited two hundred and fourteen pages in Samuel Parker's *Journal of an Exploring Tour Beyond the Rocky Mountains* as the source for specific data he presented. Since I did not recall his understanding from reading that work, I reread it to determine the legitimacy of his argument.⁹ In the process I discovered that the information about Whitman's turning back for reinforcements after arriving at the Green River Rendezvous occurred several pages earlier than the first page cited in the footnote for the article, that many of the pages had no bearing on the subject and that much of what Mr. Jessett wrote was his own interpretation and not what Parker had said.

For example, Parker did not evidence surprise at finding Indians who had beliefs that were similar to Christianity; he simply listed their beliefs and did not say whether he thought they were like or unlike Christianity.¹⁰ It is true that the missionary found a man of the Spokane tribe who had been educated at the Red River school but he did not list his name, and while it may be reasonable to infer that this was Garry in light of other information we should be aware that all this data was not given by Samuel Parker and came from some other source.¹¹ The same is true of the statement that the visiting missionary was "much impressed with the superior moral behaviour of the Indians of the tribes which had sent young men back to the Red River and adopted the primitive Anglicanism they had brought back as compared to that of the tribes he saw on the lower Columbia." Such a comparison was made by Parker,¹² but it did not mention that the differences were attributable to the influence of young men who had returned from the Red River with primitive Anglicanism. In short, it appears that Mr. Jessett used Samuel Parker to bolster his own interpretation of the influence of Anglicanism in early Oregon rather than as a source of specific information deriving from Parker himself. In the process he used a blanket citation for very specific data and left an erroneous impression with his readers.

And that brings me to the matter of doubtful interpretation, which is the most difficult aspect of the article to assess. It appears to me, despite the stated purpose of relating mission history to economic and political events, that the article really attempted to revise the general understanding of the origin of Christianity among the Indians of Oregon so as to give greater credit to Anglicanism. This is a perfectly legitimate endeavor in itself, but the author in both his title and stated purpose professed to attempt something much more substantial: he said he wanted to discuss Christian missions to the Indians of Oregon (p. 147). Having assumed that task,

Mr. Jessett opened himself to the charge of lacking a sense of proportion, for no person who is familiar with the history of Christian missions in Oregon can conceivably brush off the Methodist effort in two brief paragraphs while spending two pages in relating the significance of "primitive Anglicanism" upon the natives. Nor does balanced judgment justify the inclusion of references to the influence of that primitive Anglicanism in relation to the work of other missionary groups, when the story of each effort is already highly telescoped in the presentation. I refer here to the interpretation imposed upon Samuel Parker's data (p. 151) to which I have already alluded, to Spalding's observation that Indians called him a "Black Coat" (p. 151), to the fact that Spokane Garry did not cooperate with American Board missionaries (p. 152), to the use of the term "Black Gown" in reference to the Roman Catholic missionaries (p. 153), to the concern to verify in Catholic sources that the first references to Christianity came as a result of what Mr. Jessett theorizes was the influence of a handful of Indians educated in "primitive Anglicanism" at Red River (p. 153), to the virtual justification of the Whitman massacre because "it was probably the most humane in Indian history" and due to the fact that the Indians "considered themselves Christians" (p. 155), and to the author's final evaluation which twice mentioned the impact of the training of the young Indians at Red River (p. 155). Such an interpretation may be valid and important as a revisionary effort, but it is hardly justified under the title "Christian Missions to the Indians of Oregon," which gives readers the impression that they are reading in brief compass the history of such a topic. Far less attention should be given to the Anglican role proportionately if the true perspective of Christian missions to the Indians of Oregon is to be achieved.

And, finally, it should be mentioned that the "dichotomy between the missionary and the settler" to which Mr.

Jessett referred was more subtle than he indicated. The dichotomy arose not simply from a difference between missionaries and settlers, but more from the dual nature of the missionary motivation of the Protestant Churches, which, in the years when missionaries went to Oregon, directed that both *Christianity and civilization* be carried to new territories.

Frequent references to the Church's role in Christianizing and civilizing the Indians are evident in the sources dealing with early Oregon. Mr. Jessett rightly called attention to the plan of the American Board to establish another "Plymouth colony" (p. 148) as early as 1827, but he misinterpreted the purpose. It was intended not simply to Christianize the Indians and settle the country with whites, but rather to plant "Christian institutions on the shores of the Pacific."¹³ The purpose was not only to convert the natives to the Christian faith but also to provide a moral foundation in Oregon for both the Indians and the expected white immigration from the United States. Samuel Parker expressed the same idea. "It seems apparent to any observing Christian," he wrote, "that the present is the favorable time for the introduction of the gospel and civilization among the natives of this wide interior."¹⁴ He advocated sending "practical farmers" and "artisans" as well as missionaries among the Indians, and he believed that some tribes at least were "waiting to be instructed in the arts of civilization, and in Christianity."¹⁵

The Methodist Episcopal Church also envisioned the same dual motivation for its missionaries. In its *Annual Report* for 1836 the Missionary Society pointed out that the missionaries in Oregon had constructed housing and cultivated farms as well as started religious instruction for the Indians so that the natives might be reclaimed "to the blessings of Christianity and civilized life."¹⁶ At the time the concept of "Missionary Colonization" was not limited to Oregon alone but also was attempted at a Methodist mission

in Siam. Thus, *The Christian Advocate and Journal*, which was the official organ of the Church, declared:

The project of introducing colonies of Christians in missionary stations among the heathen, is obtaining the notice of those engaged in the benevolent effort 'of evangelizing the world.' It strikes us that such a plan would be productive of the most favorable results. . . .¹⁷

Jason Lee evidenced the close relationship between proclaiming the gospel and introducing civilization when he asked that white women be sent out to set a domestic example¹⁸ and especially when he expressed the need for a civilized colony to serve as a base to sustain the missionaries in their preaching and teaching activities. In his celebrated letter to Caleb Cushing, January 17, 1839, Lee wrote:

The exclusive object of the mission is the benefit of the Indian tribes west of the Rocky mountains. But to accomplish this object, it is found necessary to cultivate the soil, erect dwelling-houses and school-houses, build mills, and, in fact, introduce all the necessaries and helps of a civilized colony. . . .¹⁹

This sentiment was the mature judgment of Lee after he had been on the scene in Oregon several years, for on his way to that country he had opposed any plans of colonization.²⁰ Apparently he was influenced shortly after his arrival by the ideas of Dr. John McLoughlin, the Hudson's Bay Company prefect, who was convinced that the Indians should be converted from their nomadic life as well as from their paganism. By 1836 McLoughlin wrote to a friend that he was pleased that the Methodist mission was teaching the Indians how to farm as well as teaching them religion, "which will Enable [sic] them to live as Civilized men—and which is the only Rational plan to be followed with Indians. . . . In short teach them Agriculture While they are instructing them in Religion."²¹

When engaged in a plan to civilize as well as Christianize the Indians it was easy for the missionaries to move

subtly from a primary concern for evangelism to a dominant desire for colonization. The dichotomy to which Mr. Jessett referred occurred so inobtrusively because developing a civilization was an integral part of the missionaries' plans almost from the outset. Protestant missionaries to Oregon were convinced that it was their task to convey their way of life as well as their faith and it was a subtle shift that led them to become more involved in the secular aspects of life than in converting the natives of the Pacific Northwest. Christianizing and civilizing the Indians were two horns of a paradox that were fine when held in proper tension, but when that tension was overbalanced a distortion resulted that produced the dichotomy which brought the missions to the Indians of Oregon to a close.

While I appreciated the overall orientation of Jessett's article I felt that some word had to be said to correct the errors embodied in it. In a scholarly journal of the integrity of *Church History* there should be more careful data and documentation, and generally there is. When one is aware of such errors it is necessary to point them out for the benefit of other scholars as well as for Mr. Jessett. It is good to find a continuing interest in the work of Christian missions in Oregon and perhaps Jessett's article is a new step toward fitting the events associated with those missions into the broader field of the expansion of Christianity and western culture in the nineteenth century and toward relating them to the larger social, economic and political circumstances of which they were a part. A closer look at the dual motivation for such missions may be one of the areas worth pursuing further at a future time.

DONALD K. GORRELL

*Minister to Students,
Ohio State University.*

1. "A Document of Mission History, 1833-43," edited with an Introduction by Robert Moulton Gatke, *Oregon Historical Society Quarterly*, XXXVI (1935), 74-75.
2. *Ibid.*, "Methodist Annual Reports Relating to the Willamette Mission (1834-1848)," Introduction and Notes by Charles Henry Carey, *Oregon Historical Society Quarterly*, XXIII (1922), 305.
3. "A Document of Mission History," *loc. cit.*, pp. 79-80; *Zion's Herald* (Boston, Mass.), December 26, 1838.
4. (New York, N.Y.), XXIX, 295-296. This is a continuation of *The Methodist Magazine and Quarterly Review*.
5. *Annual Report of the Missionary Society of the Methodist Episcopal Church, 1848* (New York: Printed at the Conference Office, 1848), p. 36.
6. *Journal of the General Conference of the Methodist Episcopal Church, 1848* (New York: Lane & Scott, 1848), pp. 39-40, 121-122.
7. *Twenty-Second Report of the American Home Missionary Society* (New York: William Osborn, 1848), p. 92; Colin Brummitt Goodykoontz, *Home Missions on the American Frontier. With Particular Reference to the American Home Missionary Society* (Caldwell, Idaho: The Caxton Printers, Ltd., 1939) p. 273.
8. *Annual Report of the American Baptist Home Mission Society, 1847* (New York: American Baptist Home Mission Rooms, 1847), pp. 58-60.
9. I was unable to secure the 1838 edition Mr. Jessett used, and that I had read earlier, but in checking some of my notes from that edition with the second edition printed in 1840 I discovered only two or three pages difference in pagination and I reread more than enough to compensate for this discrepancy. Samuel Parker, *Journal of an Exploring Tour Beyond the Rocky Mountains, Under the Direction of the American Board of Commissioners [sic] for Foreign Missions, in the Years 1835, '36, and '37* (Ithaca, N. Y.: Published by the Author, 1840).
10. *Ibid.*, pp. 190-195, 230-232, 235, 241-242, 245, 252-253.
11. *Ibid.*, p. 291. He might have referred also to Asa Smith's letter to David Greene, dated August 27, 1839, quoted in Clifford Merrill Drury, *The Diaries and Letters of Henry H. Spalding and Asa Bowen Smith Relating to the Nez Perce Mission, 1838-1842* (Glendale, California: Arthur H. Clark Company, 1958), p. 107, or to other works that substantiated his point.
12. *Op. cit.*, p. 277.
13. *The Missionary Herald* (Boston, Mass.), XXIII, 397.
14. *Op. cit.*, p. 255.
15. *Ibid.*, pp. 244, 306.
16. "Methodist Annual Reports Relating to the Willamette Mission," *loc. cit.*, p. 307.
17. (New York, N. Y.), August 19, 1836.
18. *Ibid.*, extra edition published July 1, 1836.
19. *H. R. Report No. 101, 25th Congress, 3rd Session*, Appendix H, pp. 3-4.
20. Letter of Jason Lee written July 1, 1834, when he was first on his way to Oregon, *Christian Advocate and Journal* (New York, N. Y.), September 26, 1834.
21. McLoughlin to Edward Ermatinger, February 1, 1836, "Letters of Dr. John McLoughlin," with Introduction by T. C. Elliott, *Oregon Historical Society Quarterly*, XXIII (1922), 368.

DOCTORAL DISSERTATIONS

"The History of the Jesuits' Estates, 1760-1888." By Roy Clinton Dalton. University of Minnesota, 1957. 391 pp. L. C. Card No. Mic 58-297.

The Jesuits' Estates Act of 1888 aroused a political storm in the Dominion which led to the suggestion in a leading Canadian newspaper, the *Toronto Globe*, that the union of the provinces of Canada might not survive it. The agitation which the act provoked was the evil fruit of misinformation, ignorance, and religious bigotry, and it seriously endangered the unity of the country.

When the act was passed there was no balanced historical account of the Jesuits' estates. Two or three accounts existed, but they were partial and partisan. Nor, to the writer's knowledge, has there been any subsequent study that is even approximately satisfactory. The purchase of this thesis, then, is to provide the historical background for the controversial act of 1888 in as full and unbiased a manner as human limitations will permit. Since the repercussions of the act are well known, they are treated only in a very summary fashion at the conclusion of this work.

The history of the Jesuits' estates from the British conquest is divided into fairly clear periods. The first of these covers forty years, and is treated in the first four chapters. Much of the trouble in later years arose from misinterpretation of the detailed history of the estates during these four decades. The 1760 capitulatory articles in favor of the proprietary rights of the Jesuits began the confusion. This became progressively confounded by the suppression of the Order by European Catholic rulers and finally by the Pope in 1773, by the British decision to suppress the Order and confiscate its properties, by the efforts of Jeffery, Lord Amherst, to secure possession of the estates, by strong efforts of the people of the province to have the estates de-

voted to education, and by the extensive and intensive provincial investigation of the estates.

Chapter V, which is not strictly a part of the narrative for the period from 1763 to 1888, is nevertheless, one of the most important parts of the study because it contains an analysis of all the title deeds of the principal parts of the Jesuits' estates. A lengthy set of appendices, consisting of extracts from the French title deeds, is a vital supplement to the chapter.

Chapter VI covers the period from 1800, when the last Canadian Jesuit died and the British government formally took possession of the estates; to 1832, when the provincial government, after many vain efforts, finally got control of all the properties, except the college, to be used for education.

During the period from 1832 to 1841, the subject of chapter VII, the Assembly continued to agitate for the restoration of the Jesuits' college, which was used by Imperial troops as a barracks, and made numerous protests against the manner in which the estates were managed by a Commissioner appointed by the executive and not responsible to the Assembly.

Chapter VIII explains the developments leading to a decision to use the Jesuits' estates revenues exclusively for education in Canada East.

The final chapter deals with the controversy which arose between the restored Society of Jesus and the provincial hierarchy of the Catholic Church over the question of compensation by the province of Quebec for the loss of the estates. The act of settlement of 1888, which provides the occasion and the culmination for the present study, was the provincial government's solution of what seemed to be otherwise an insoluble, as well as a most embarrassing, problem.

By permission from *Dissertation Abstracts*.

"The Last Phase of Nestorian History." By John Joseph. Princeton University, 1957. 291 pp. L. C. Card No. Mic 58-303.

The aim of this dissertation is to extend and correct our knowledge of the modern history of the Nestorians through careful and critical investigation.

The aim of this study is first attained by an intensive study of the nineteenth century sources. The purpose here was to reconstruct that history—which forms the first part of this work—as far as possible, from contemporary sources uncolored by the influences of subsequent occurrences. Generally speaking, no systematic study has been made of the Nestorian history during this period. The printed documents of the British government, its consular reports, the unpublished Foreign Office archival material at the Public Record Office, the correspondence of missionaries to the Nestorians, their memoirs, and other travelers' eyewitness reports constitute the major sources used to determine the findings of the first part of this dissertation. For the second half of this work, which covers the period following the first world war, a critical investigation of the League of Nations' documents and reports in addition to a great amount of material—mostly partisan and narrow in approach—which has been published in the Near East and abroad, has made it possible to rewrite this last phase of the Nestorian history in accordance with the stated purpose of this dissertation.

It has been found that the semi-independence and the good relations which existed between the Nestorians and their Kurdish neighbors in general were seriously impaired after the 1840's. The Nestorians were an important factor in the destruction of the independent Kurdish confederacy set up under the just and peaceful rule of the Bohtān chief. The Nestorian patriarchal "temporal" authority, an issue between some of the Nestorian leaders and the Iraqi government, was contested by both the Kurdish amīrs and the Ottoman authorities about a cen-

tury ago.

Western missionaries were especially interested in the Nestorians. While the American Protestants wanted to revive and use the old missionary spirit of the Nestorians in their [missionary] efforts to spread the Gospel, the Roman Catholic and Russian Orthodox evangelists were interested in the proselytization of the Nestorians. Great Britain supported the politically neutral American missionaries in their effort to secure political and social justice for the Nestorians lest they be tempted to proselyte with the hope to acquire a title to the active sympathy and protection of France and Russia. Thus while the Nestorians (especially those of Persia) experienced a religious, social and educational awakening as a result of Western missionary efforts, they acquired an active discontent with their lot and developed a sense of superiority to their Muslim neighbors—an attitude which, to a certain extent, they also learned from their Western benefactors.

During the postwar period the British government made efforts to repatriate the Nestorians until the Mosul question was discussed at the Lausanne Conference. British emphasis that the Nestorian homegrounds in Hakkāri be included within the Iraqi territory and there retain their "traditional autonomy" was most probably the chief reason why the League of Nations frontier commission recommended the exceptional autonomous status for the Nestorians in the Mosul vilayet, without the cession of Turkish Hakkāri. The misinterpretation of the above facts by the British government before the Permanent Mandates Commission and the manner in which that international body handled the Nestorian problem have been found to be the sources of the misunderstanding between the Nestorian leaders and the Iraqi government.

Other conceptions about the Nestorians, such as opinions with regard to their name, language and ethnic origin have been revised in this study.

By permission from *Dissertation Abstracts*.

"*La Croix* and the *Ralliement*." By Raymond Joseph Marion. Clark University, 1957. 193 pp. L. C. Card No. Mic 58-305.

Supervisor: Dwight E. Lee.

One of the many groups who fought secular republicanism in France during the latter part of the nineteenth century was a relatively new order, the Fathers of the Assumption. Father d'Alzon, their founder, especially dedicated the order to the fight against secular liberalism, and for this purpose planned an active role in education, pilgrimages, missions, and the popular press. In order to fulfill this last objective the daily *La Croix* was founded in June 1883. Headed by Father Vincent de Paul Bailly, who remained editor of the paper until 1901, *La Croix* purposely attacked mercilessly the Masonic lodges which it considered to be the main forces behind all the laic laws.

While the Assumptionists, following Father d'Alzon's orders, refused to support a political party, the same behavior was not generally found among the rest of the French clergy, who after the fall of the Second Empire had become strong supporters of royalism, less from a deepseated loyalty to the monarchy than from fear of republican secularism. Consequently, Leo XIII, who wisely saw that this situation could only lead to a greater republican hostility toward the Church, officially proclaimed the *ralliement* in 1892, two years after Cardinal Lavigerie had prepared the ground. While the Pope expected French Catholics to accept the Republic, he encouraged them to continue the fight against the laic laws.

The Assumptionists, in accord with their founder's basic tenet of obedience to the papacy, sincerely accepted the *ralliement* but with little enthusiasm. It seemed to them that Moderates as well as Radical Republicans could not be expected to minimize the lay program so dear to them. Hence, *La Croix* took full advantage of the Pope's wish that Catholics not only continue to assail the laws against the Church, but also actively take part in political affairs. Very aggressively at times, *La*

Croix attacked such things as civil marriages and funerals, military service for clergymen and seminarians, lay schools and Masonic influence in society. But it was particularly violent during the nineties against two laws which it considered to be the first state assault preparatory to the ultimate abolition of Church liberties.

The first law (1893) placed the supervision of Church property (*fabriques*) under greater state control. The second act, *loi d'abonnement* (1895), made discriminatory and more onerous a kind of inheritance tax (*impôt d'accroissement*) upon religious congregations. Against these acts *La Croix* waged a relentless battle, even failing, with reference to the tax, to respect the freedom of action which the Pope had accorded religious orders. Likewise in electoral matters, *La Croix*, while doing a tremendous job in organizing the Catholic vote through the *Comité Justice-Egalité*, too often failed to understand the full import of the Pope's electoral plan. At one point it even concluded that the Pope had two policies and that the Assumptionists had obtained the Pope's personal approval for the one they were following.

So far *La Croix* had campaigned essentially for religious ends, but with the Dreyfus Affair, blinded by a fanatical anti-Semitism, it crusaded in an arena which became its undoing. Waldeck-Rousseau, who hated the Assumptionists for their anti-secularism, now had the opportunity to do away with the *moines ligueurs* and *moines d'affaires*, as he called them. As a result, the Assumptionists were forced to leave France, and, in the end, had contributed to the failure of the *ralliement*. Although they had accepted the Republic willingly, they had also passionately attacked any trace of laicism. But their zeal sometimes blinded them to the real purposes of the Vatican, and more important, their short-sighted anti-Semitism made them targets for the republican opposition.

By permission from *Dissertation Abstracts*.

BOOK REVIEWS

Die Kindertaufe in den vier ersten Jahrhunderten. By JOACHIM JEREMIAS, Göttingen: Vandenhoeck and Ruprecht, 1958. 127 pp.

The baptism of children has existed in the Christian church since a time earlier than Tertullian's treatise *On Baptism* (A. D. 200/206), in which he urges that *parvuli* (little children) should wait until adolescence before being baptized, since only then can they learn, be instructed, and know Christ. Tertullian's notion met little favor with other Christians before the fourth century, when we know of nine persons whose baptisms were delayed—in Augustine's case until he was 32 years old. These cases were exceptional; Jeremias suggests that they were characteristic (if that) only of the upper classes (p. 102).

Real difficulties arise when we try to go behind Tertullian. The only clear statement in the New Testament (I Cor. 7:14) shows that a child whose father or mother was a Christian was not baptized. The children who were baptized were those whose whole family was converted to Christianity (Acts 2:38-39); they were baptized with their father's or mother's "house" (I Cor. 6:16; Acts 16:15; 16:33; 18:8). In such circumstances the situation resembled that found in Jewish baptism of proselytes, which is pre-Christian, according to Jeremias, because it was discussed by disciples of Shammai and Hillel and is alluded to in the *Testament of Levi* 14, 6 (pp. 29-34; Jeremias regards *Levi* as Jewish rather than Jewish-Christian).

If children of Christians were not baptized in the earliest period, when did the situation change? Jeremias argues that, though the event described in Mark 10:13-16 has nothing to do with baptism, the saying of Jesus quoted there was preserved and interpreted in relation to it (cf. Matt. 18:3; John 3:5; Justin, *Apol.* 1, 61, 4; *Const. Apost.* 6, 15, 5). The Greek

word *kouein* became a technical term in relation to baptism (pp. 65-66, supporting an argument by Cullmann). But unfortunately it is not clear that in Mark 10:14 it is so used—cf. Mark 9:39.

The only clear statement provided by ancient writers on the origin of infant baptism is given by Origen in his commentary on Romans (5, 9): "from the apostles the church received a tradition to give baptism even to infants." It is impossible to say that Origen could, or could not, have given proof for his statement; he seems to be relying on John 3:5. In a homily on Leviticus (8, 3) he simply says that the practice is characteristic of the church. And of the proofs which Jeremias provides from second-century writers only one is really convincing. Irenaeus says (*Adv. haer.* 2, 22, 4, p. 330 Harvey) that "Jesus came to save all through himself; all, I mean, who through him are reborn into God—infants and children and boys and young men and older men." The objection of A. Benoit (*Le baptême chrétien au second siècle*, Paris, 1953, 217) that this should not be taken literally, since Irenaeus based his notion on the idea that Christ passed through all the ages of man (including old age), is mistaken since Irenaeus actually believed that Christ *did* reach the age of fifty. Therefore we find evidence for infant baptism in the Jewish-Christian church of Asia Minor, from which Irenaeus emerged; and if it existed there, it probably existed elsewhere—and it was probably based on the kind of early tradition highly valued in this kind of Christianity. But real evidence from an earlier time is lacking. Polycarp was probably baptized in infancy, since at the time of his martyrdom he had been a Christian for 86 years; but his parents may well have been converts.

Jeremias concluded that (1) the baptizing of children was originally

confined to those whose parents were converted; (2) between A.D. 60 and A.D. 70 it was extended to children born in Christian families; and (3) it has remained the normal practice from that time onward, in spite of Tertullian's objections and the unusual situation, based on a misunderstanding of baptism and criticized by church authorities, in the fourth century. We are not entirely convinced that the date given in the second conclusion is correct. There is no conclusive evidence from a time earlier than 180, though we may well suppose that the practice goes back several generations before Irenaeus. On the other hand, the normal practice, even earlier, was surely to baptize whole households of converts. The New Testament texts already mentioned indicate that this is so, and some words of Ignatius (*Smyrn.* 13, 1) point in the same direction. Moreover, at an early time it must have been recognized that the situation of children born before and after their parents' conversion was anomalous. The precise date when infant baptism became universal cannot be determined; the significance of the search for this date will vary with the searcher's view of the relation between scripture and tradition.

ROBERT M. GRANT
University of Chicago

The Lapsed, The Unity of the Catholic Church. By ST. CYPRIAN. Translated and annotated by Maurice Bévenot, S.J. (Ancient Christian Writers, Volume XXV.) Westminster, Maryland: The Newman Press; and London: Longmans, Green & Co., 1957. 133 pp. \$2.75.

Perhaps the greatest value of this book, apart from its readable translation and learned annotation, is the stimulation it ought to give slightly exasperated readers to re-open studies on the early Christian ministry and the rise of Roman primacy. A key document for this problem is Cyprian's essay on the unity of the church here presented, together with the less important treatise on the lapsed, in the

Ancient Christian Writers series. This series, edited by Roman Catholics, has been noteworthy for its objectivity as well as its enlistment of Protestant scholarship. This volume does not fully measure up to its predecessors. Father Bévenot's rather too confident assertions by which he disposes of the learned argumentation of great scholars of the recent past (E. Caspar, H. Koch, among others) do not sufficiently respect the difficulties of the problem. B. is obviously a highly competent specialist on Cyprian, as his notes and previous publications attest; nor is he fighting along denominational lines. He rather ignores the validity of positions which do not agree with the results of his own previously published researches.

The well-known textual problem involving the received text and the primacy text is resolved by B. in favor of Cyprianic authorship of both, PT aimed at Novatian in behalf of the Bishop of Rome, TR revised against Bishop Stephan after the falling out over the baptismal question. B. does not think that PT was meant to defend the modern concept of the papacy, but that the basic Roman primacy dogma was actually there in an undeveloped stage. The phrase, *primatus Petro datur*, is translated: "A primacy is given to Peter." This is an attempt, as B. informs us, to preserve the ambiguity of the expression. To Cyprian it could mean that Peter was the first to receive the same gift given to all the rest; to Romans it could mean the gift of superiority. With the help of the theory of latent meaning it can certainly be made to support extreme Roman claims.

Obviously this is not the last word on the subject, and we will go no further than to express a hope that the renewal of studies in ancient church history will not omit the doctrine of the ministry and the idea of authority. Post-war archeology and manuscript findings should surely promote this.

It should be added that the detailed notes are of special interest to students of Latin and the texts.

Chicago RICHARD BAEPLER

The Beginnings of Christian Art.
By D. TALBOT RICE. Nashville, New York: Abingdon Press, 1957. 223 pp. \$7.95.

Prof. Talbot Rice of Edinburgh, the author of an important work on Byzantine art, has published a valuable introduction to early Christian art. He begins by treating Patristic painting, mosaics, and sculpture in their dependence upon pre-Christian art forms, making extensive use of the Dura fragments and the Roman Catacombs. Then he describes the Christian art of the mosaics of Rome and Ravenna and their counterpart in the East. He follows Western art through the early Middle Ages and finally devotes six chapters to Byzantine art from the ninth through the sixteenth centuries. Each chapter concludes with two or three books for suggested further study, for which we advise the student of Christian art to learn Italian. Over seventy illustrations give extensive and excellent material, and the 21 drawings in the text add to the quality of the book. The main interest and emphasis lie on Byzantine art, which gives to the work its unique note. Here, the author speaks with masterful authority, and the student receives a powerful introduction into a salient period of Christian art to its death in the 16th century. Because of this interest, the development in the West is drawn out somewhat too scantily. Beside the famous book illustrations, the frescoes of Reichenau and Müstair, for instance, should appear by all means in such an introduction. The chapter on early British art, however, offers fascinating details. My objection to the book concerns the reproductions. At a time when the Skira publications have created a new standard of perfection in art printing, a work of this price range ought to contain better prints. To be sure, it is often extremely difficult to reproduce damaged frescoes, as Grabar realized in his work on early medieval painting, but this does not excuse poor mosaic reproductions and prints of well-preserved paintings. A work on Christian art ought to have esthetic quality, not only in a striking paper

cover! Nevertheless, this work ought to be used by our theological schools not only to introduce the students to Christian art but also to demonstrate to them the importance of Eastern Christianity in the field of Christian art.

SAMUEL LAEUCHLI
Garrett Biblical Institute

Atlas of the Early Christian World.
By F. VAN DER MEER and CHRISTINE MOHRMANN. Translated and edited by Mary F. Hedlund and H. H. Rowley. London and Edinburgh: Thomas Nelson and Sons, Ltd., 1958. 216 pp.; 42 maps; 620 ill. \$15.00.

This magnificent volume is much more than an atlas. It is a monumental, vivid survey of the first six centuries of the Christian era and would form a valuable companion to D. Talbot Rice's *The Beginnings of Christian Art* (Abingdon Press, 1957). The forty-two maps in color are gathered in the front of the book for easy reference and are invaluable for a geographical knowledge of the early Christian Church.

The main text principally serves to outline and explain the 620 beautiful reproductions that form the real basis of this volume. One of the excellent features of this volume is the use of translations from pagan and early Christian writers themselves as commentary on the plates. The book is divided into three principal chapters: I: "The Church of the Martyrs A.D. 50-313"; II: "The Church of the Empire A.D. 313-600"; and III: "The Fathers of the Church and Early Christian Literature."

The cooperation of four scholars in the publication of this volume makes it truly an international work. The magnificent plates illustrate all kinds of aspects of early Christian life ranging from portraits of Christ, baptism, Eucharist, burial, church architecture to the most important centers in early Christianity as well as the most important people.

The plates, the maps, and the commentary provide a triple source of

edification and delight for the reader. "The authors can safely claim that in its scope and quality this magnificent collection of illustrations is unique." (Foreword by H. H. Rowley). We must agree wholeheartedly.

JOHN E. REXINE

Colgate University

The Age of Luther. By IDA WALZ BLAYNEY. New York: Vantage Press, 1957. 499 pp. \$5.00.

The author, professor of German at Carleton College, has written a comprehensive account of the Renaissance and of Luther's reforming activity and thought. Approximately one-third of the volume deals with the Renaissance and admirably encompasses the many facets of this fertile and complicated period. Included are accounts of the political scene in Europe generally and in Germany particularly. There are also digests of the outlook of such diverse figures as Machiavelli, Sir Thomas More, Giordano Bruno, Montaigne, Reuchlin, Ulrich von Hutten, Paracelsus, and Copernicus. A major section is also given to Renaissance art, accompanied too by brief accounts of the life and artistic work of continental and particularly German artists.

The difficulty in this major section on the Renaissance and Humanism in Europe is that it remains on the level of a series of independent sketches. While the author assumes that the variety of forms do provide us with a full perspective, she nowhere clearly and fully delineates it. Nor is this material related in any full or penetrating way to the life and work of Luther, which does occupy the major portion of the book.

The intent in the case of Luther is to set forth his life and thought through extensive quotations from the sources. This has indeed been carried out and in many places the author's own writing is the connective web for the passages. While the Weimar and Erlangen editions are both utilized, greater dependence apparently falls on the latter. The severest limitation of the book, and this is perhaps unfairly to question the author's intention, is that

there is no reference whatsoever to the wealth of excellent literature on Luther which has appeared in recent decades. Apart from the references, there is no trace that such works have entered deeply, if at all, into the writing of this volume. By a straightforward textual (?) exposition of Luther, the author has easily succeeded in bypassing many problems in Luther's interpretation which have exercised authorities on Luther for a long time.

JOHN DILLENBERGER
Drew University

The Paul's Cross Sermons 1534-1642. By MILLAR MACLURE. Toronto: Toronto University Press, 1958. 261 pp. \$5.50.

St. Paul's churchyard is known to have served as a public meeting-place for the people of London as far back as the thirteenth century. By the middle of the fourteenth century a cross and a pulpit of some description had been set up in the angle of choir and transept and sermons were being delivered more or less regularly by preachers invited or rather summoned for the occasion. The duty assigned to these preachers was of course to edify the citizenry in approved doctrine but also to bring doctrine to the support of the interests and policies favored by the government of the day. Thus the pulpit at Paul's Cross became an organ of expression used by the authorities of church and state for the shaping, direction and control of public opinion. The series of Paul's Cross sermons still extant reflects from that angle the changing currents of thought and policy from Henry VIII to the Long Parliament. In 1633 the practice was transferred from the churchyard to the church itself. In March 1642 occurred the last sermon by an episcopally appointed preacher. A year later the cross was demolished by order of parliament. Not the least useful part of the present work is a register of the sermons delivered from this uniquely important pulpit, beginning with a discourse of 1534 in support of Henry's argument concerning divorce and concluding

with another pleading for unity under the crown. The author fixes appropriately enough upon the latter as the end of Paul's Cross preaching, though he might have pointed out that the indoctrination of the people in the interest of the powers of the day went on unabated under the Long Parliament both at St. Paul's and St. Margaret's Westminster.

The sermons preached at Paul's Cross claim particular attention as the expression of current official policy in church and state. Their importance in their own time was due primarily to the importance of the Bible and the part played by the pulpit in general in the public life of the community. Dr. MacLure's study of Paul's Cross sermons therefore quite properly and necessarily becomes a study not simply of the work of that one pulpit taken by itself but of that pulpit in its historical context, of the sixteenth- and seventeenth-century sermon as an instrument for directing opinion, and of the course of opinion itself throughout the period. As such his book performs a valuable service not only for students of church history but for students of the history of public opinion in the broadest sense at a time when the importance of public opinion was becoming crucial. Modern historians of the period, for reasons arising naturally enough from the history of their own discipline, have not in general known how to read sermons and have been unwilling or too impatient to cope with their peculiar idiom. The English pulpit, whatever else it did, promoted a degree and a kind of familiarity with the scriptures in the vernacular public such as few of us would now even care to lay claim to. But the public of that age found in the scriptures an apparatus of ideas and images which served men of all classes and with all sorts of interests as a ready vehicle for thought and discussion about the multiplying problems in human relations in a rapidly changing society. To the modern reader sermons may seem preposterously remote from anything going on at the time. To the men of that age, knowing their Bible in the way they

did, any sermon but especially a Paul's Cross sermon might have an acute immediate relevance to a pressing actuality. It was a relevance which now requires the kind of explanation we find in this illuminating book.

To be sure certain limitations of outlook appear in its early and middle chapters. The mildness of ecclesiastical authorities in dealing with Anne Askew was not unlimited but surely that "annoying" woman did not submit to torture and the stake merely because she knew it would tease the bishop. It is not only "disgruntled minorities" which have taken to compiling martyrologies. Gardiner was "brave" but is "fantastic" the only epithet to be applied to Hooper? Surely there were reasons during the reign of Elizabeth I for attacks upon the Roman faith just as real as the need to define the *via media*. "Exasperating exhibitions of analogy *quae non sequitur*" were surely not confined to "extreme reformers." These however are small matters which the author does not allow to detract from the larger spirited imaginative treatment which he accords to all aspects of his subject in the later chapters of this brilliant and important book.

WILLIAM HALLER
Folger Shakespeare Library.

Die Einheit des Bundes, das Verhältnis von Altem und Neuem Testamente bei Calvin. By HANS HEINRICH WOLF. Neukirchen Kreis Moers: Verlag der Buchhandlung des Erziehungsvereins, 1958. 171 pp. 12, 60 DM.

Considerable work has been done in the past few years in studying the hermeneutics of the Reformation. Monographs have been dedicated to the study of Luther, Calvin, and Melanchthon. The present work deals with both a hermeneutical and a theological problem in the writings of John Calvin. It is a dissertation published for the first time in 1940. One may wonder whether the author is justified in republishing a work which first appeared nearly twenty years ago. He is aware of this problem and indicates that in reprinting he is following the

advice of a number of scholars rather than his own personal feeling. With all his respect for the theological work of Calvin he is not certain that Calvin's ideas about the relationship between the Old and the New Testament are too helpful for the present theological discussion (p. 7). Furthermore if he were to approach the subject today he would be more critical of Calvin than he was in the first edition.

After a brief introduction in which the author takes issue with certain interpretations of Calvin's view on this subject, his own work is divided into three chapters, the first one dealing with the unity of the Covenant, the second chapter dealing with different actualizations or realizations of the one covenant, the third chapter dealing with the unity of the covenant and the practical exposition of the Scriptures. The result of his research is that Calvin is shown to have a view of the unity of the Old and New Testaments which amounts to a virtual identification of the Old and New Testaments, which sees the difference between the two only in the area of administration. Wolf notes, (following the earlier verdict of Schrenk,) that in this respect Calvin is indebted to Zwingli and Bullinger. Their tensions with the Anabaptists and the desire to establish a state church brought about the formulation of the Biblical idea of the Covenant (p. 20ff). This unity of the covenants is carried into the sphere of the ethics as well as the cultic conduct of the church. With extensive quotations, indicating a thorough acquaintance with the writings of Calvin, the author documents his work painstakingly. Most of the quotations are translated into German and the organization of the book is both logical and inclusive.

There are two questions which occur to the reviewer. The first relates to the background of Calvin's hermeneutics. In his introduction to the Gospel commentary Calvin pays elaborate tribute to Bucer. A study of Bucer's view on this subject reveals a very limited degree of difference between these two leaders on the relation of

the Old and the New Testaments. Bucer hammered his view out in controversy with the Anabaptists, and it may well be that while Calvin was in Strasbourg he was caught in the same controversy. The second question which is not sufficiently dealt with is the comparative status which the New Testament has in relation to the Old. What constitutes "newness" according to Calvin? Granted that the Anabaptists stressed mainly the discontinuity between the Old and New, is it not possible that Calvin ignored the new element? The danger of making the incarnation simply an afterthought is inherent in this approach. If the Anabaptists ignored the Old Testament (and this still needs to be proved) and Calvin's preoccupation with the unity of the covenants is an element in his reaction against the Anabaptists, then we can only conclude that he overstated his case.

We are happy to note that the author has completed a volume dealing in greater detail with the theological problem of the relation between the Old and New Testaments, and we look forward to getting the fruits of his research in this area. There is no doubt that this work merited a second edition and anyone who would learn about Calvin's view of the covenant will find much help and stimulation here.

WILLIAM KLASSEN
Mennonite Biblical Seminary

The Making of Walton's Lives. By DAVID NOVARR. Ithaca : Cornell University Press, 1958. xvi, 527 pp. \$6.50.

Born in 1593, the year in which Hooker's *Polity* first appeared, Izaak Walton lived to be 90 and to write, as a pious layman devoted to the High Church cause, the *Lives* of five famous men of his century who soon or late had entered Holy Orders: John Donne, Sir Henry Wotton, Richard Hooker, George Herbert, and Bishop Sanderson. The earliest was that of Donne (in 1640), a mere 17 pages written hastily to preface a published collection of Donne's sermons, for which Wotton (who died in 1639) had intended to

write a biography but had at last handed over the task to Walton. The latest was that of Sanderson (in 1678), a separately published and matured portrait of the Bishop of Lincoln who had died fifteen years earlier and whom Walton had first met in 1638. Each of the five biographies underwent one or more revisions by Walton for later editions. The nature and significance of these revisions, alongside a study of the genesis and purpose of each of the Lives, makes up the scope of Novarr's illuminating and very learned book.

Novarr shows how Walton's native temperament, his enlarging circle of friendships, and the problems of his own times combined to form in him an outlook congenial to the High Church party and serviceable to its interests. Walton was a religious man but not a theologian. Lacking formal education, he was content to borrow from his established friends their official stand on matters of controversy, and largely to bypass intellectual debate in favor of the testimony of moral saintliness. What he looked for in religion was meekness, prayer, and good works, based on "plain unperplexed doctrine." What he disliked in the non-conformists was their disputatious opinion-mongering and their factious violence. His ideal of "primitive piety" centered around a "peaceable passive" behavior, a holy retiredness of temper, adorned with benign studiousness. As Novarr remarks, Walton *appears undogmatic* because of his humble language and his "confession that he cannot grasp complicated arguments about doctrine"; yet he "insists dogmatically that the pathway to heaven is a plain one, and he insists dogmatically on the necessity for moderation." The paradox here should remind us that dogma never can really be avoided, even when an ethic of humility is made central. We can appreciate, moreover, how Walton's dogma helped support social stability.

Walton's single-minded affection for "meek and contented quietness" aided his art too. It provided the biographer his sure sense of values, by which he could form a character-image that has

unity; he could cut his way through an embarrassing richness of documents exactly because he knew what he wanted to say, and could select, shape, and refine his details accordingly. His model, Novarr suggests, was the character-writing of Overbury, in which details are assembled deductively from a prior image of a mode of conduct.

But due to Walton's anti-intellectualism, the image is a narrowed one which oversimplifies. His picture of Sanderson, for example, omits the subtlety of Sanderson's mind; the Bishop's book-titles are listed but their doctrine is not discussed. Further, the great casuist is made to declare that we may safely be ignorant of knotty doctrinal points, "because Almighty God intends not to lead us to Heaven by hard Questions but by meekness and charity, and a frequent practice of Devotion." By details which illustrate Sanderson's mild temper, open-mindedness, and devotion to pastoral duties, Walton in fact hides the man's somewhat shifting doctrinal position and his political sophistication. Similarly, the ambiguities of Hooker's stand on episcopacy and monarchy are neatly evaded in various ways: by emphasizing Hooker's friendship with Saravia, whose determined stand on apostolic succession was well known; by introducing circumstances which imply that Hooker's Books VI-VIII were tampered with before their posthumous publication; by transferring to an appendix Walton's own brief on these technical matters while suggesting their minor value for appreciating the real Hooker, a shy scholar of dove-like temper in Walton's portraiture, a man eager to quit public controversy for the quiet of a country parish and its pastoral work—a reading based largely on guesswork, as Sisson's recent book has shown. In the case of Wotton, likewise, there is a blurring over of his activities of intrigue while Ambassador at Venice; a digression on historical background is used to suggest the passage of these years, along with a few anecdotes that show Wotton as wit and philanthropist, after which we move on to Wotton's final years of pious serenity as Provost

of Eton, where Walton can safely characterize him as "a great enemy of wrangling disputes of Religion." Donne is given to us, similarly, shorn of wrangling; his activities and Bishop Morton's in the book-war against Rome are not recounted—instead, we are told, more generally, that Donne was searching "with humility and diffidence" through the body of controversy in divinity in order to rectify his personal religious scruples. Nor are the irregularities of Donne's secular life recounted, except for the touching story of his forgivably impetuous marriage. Thus the portrait is given unity as a story of steady progress from an early religious interest, through misfortune and a deepening study, to a climax in holy orders and holy dying. By means of "tremendous specificity" in parts of Donne's life, Walton has achieved credence, says Novarr, and made his readers forget his gaping lacunae. This method, supported with occasional fictionalized episodes, runs through the structure of all the Lives.

Novarr's study also includes a number of wayside investigations into problems relevant to church history. He sketches in, for example, Bishop Morley's attitude toward comprehension; Bishop Sanderson's shifts in doctrine; and Baxter's role at the Savoy Conference. For information on such matters, as well as for his masterful understanding of the skill by which Walton has intricately imbedded his own perspective in his seemingly "objective" biographies, we can long be grateful to Novarr's labors.

Roy W. BATTENHOUSE
Indiana University.

The Independents in the English Civil War. By GEORGE YULE. New York: Cambridge University Press, 1958. 156 pp. \$4.00

This is chiefly a work of parliamentary analysis. The author confronts the problem of defining the Independent political party—its extent, aims, composition, and role in the history of the Revolution. (His concern with Independency as a religious movement is minor.) In doing so he attacks part

of an outstanding problem in interpreting the Civil Wars—the comparison and correlation of political, social, and religious motives behind party groupings. This approach has already been used with regard to the Levellers, but work on the Independent party has been slight. The two well known articles by J. H. Hexter, "The Problem of the Presbyterian Independents" (*American Historical Review*, 1938) and H. R. Trevor-Roper, "The Gentry 1540-1640" (*Economic History Review*, Supplement, 1953) contribute hypotheses which the author carefully considers. He blunts Hexter's paradoxes about the Presbyterianism of some "Independent" M. P.'s but has more difficulty with Trevor-Roper's association of the Independents with the declining and discontented lesser gentry. Though avowedly attracted to this suggestion, he concludes that evidence is too uncertain and returns to a cautious and hesitant belief in religion as the unifying factor.

Because of this conclusion it is unfortunate that discussion of the Independent churches is not fuller. A chapter on "The Religious Origins of the Independents" divorces the movement from Brownism and stresses the importance of Henry Jacob's London church of 1616, but the progress of later Independent thinking is only briefly related. And while it is true that orthodox Independency conservatively sought the preservation of an Establishment, the author seems to have inadequate appreciation of Cromwell's vision of a Christian state indiscriminately benevolent to all congregations which maintained Protestant essentials. Perhaps some further unsureness of the religious background is suggested by references to John Goodwin as "John Goodman" (p. 22) and "Thomas Goodwin" (p. 66).

The book is equipped with appendices listing, with brief biographical notes, all "Independent" commons members and Independent ministers. Though of limited usefulness to church historians, the work's careful classifications and analyses build up a detailed picture of what lay behind the In-

dependent label.

J. F. MACLEAR
University of Minnesota (Duluth)

Puritans, Lawyers, and Politics in Early Seventeenth-Century England. By JOHN DYKSTRA EUSDEN. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1958. 238 pp. \$4.50.

The title of this book does not really do justice to its content. This is a thorough and skillful analysis of the political philosophy of two central intellectual professions in the first three decades of seventeenth-century England—the Puritan clergy and the lawyers of the common law. The work, begun as a Yale doctoral dissertation, did not take the path originally intended. The author had hoped to explore the mutual influences of Puritanism and common law but early concluded that these could not be demonstrated. Accordingly, he altered focus to make his study an examination of ideological parallels—with very satisfying results.

The book's argument revolves around the comparison of the Puritans' conception of divine sovereignty and the lawyers' reliance on fundamental law. Both philosophies served as bases for challenging absolutist pretensions of the Stuarts. Both prompted a distrust of speculation, an emphasis on "given" particular law, and a capacity to develop conservatively within England's legal tradition. Neither tolerated the royalist view of authority: they had no place for a hierarchy of institutions endowed with life from the crown which alone was independent. Instead, they required a plurality of institutions, not interdependent, but all under God and fundamental law. On this basis Puritans and lawyers contended for the independence of the church, the universities, the law courts, and the inns of court. Finally, the "Puritan-common law" outlook penetrated parliament and shaped the arguments of the constitutional opposition from the accession of James I to Charles I's personal rule. The author believes that this pattern of political thinking, rather than tactical or prudential considera-

tions, cemented the alliance of Puritans and lawyers in politics. What is of greater moment is his conclusion that the resultant doctrine of limited power had lasting effect on the English constitutional tradition, despite parliament's temporary abandonment of it to promote its own sovereignty in the emergency after 1640.

Throughout the work a difficult subject is handled with maturity and assurance. Weaving together the often complicated strands of religious, legal, and constitutional history, the author explicates the intellectual outlook of his subjects with clarity, precision, and caution. At times he rightly declines to claim too much and does not hesitate to show us uncertainties. Characterizing professions, he has had to base conclusions on a limited number of representatives, but his choices are central. His argument has required some modification of some frequent assumptions. He gives prominence to the Calvinist and legalistic aspects of Puritanism. He discounts the importance of covenant thought at this time, partly by regarding Ames and others as chiefly American in influence. He believes that "the early seventeenth century . . . was dead water in the flow of natural law political thought in England" (p. 131). Two omissions puzzle. Some other institutions with which Puritans and lawyers were closely associated—commissions of peace, lectureships, feoffees of impropriations—might have appeared as a part of this story. And one wishes for a more solid demonstration of parliament's link with "Puritan-common law" thought. The work is essential for anyone seeking to understand pre-Revolutionary political thought and opinion.

J. F. MACLEAR
University of Minnesota (Duluth)

The Eighteenth Century Revolution in Spain. By RICHARD HERR. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1958. xii, 484 pp. \$7.50.

Within recent years two exceptional books have appeared on the badly neglected field of the cultural and economic history of Spain in the latter

part of the eighteenth century — (1) *l'Espagne éclairée de la seconde moitié du XVIIIe siècle* (Paris, 1954) by Jean Sarrailh, Rector of the University of Paris, and (2) that by Mr. Herr. Both studies are based upon extensive research in Spanish and French archives and libraries. The two supplement each other, revealing complete independence in treatment.

The title of Mr. Herr's book is somewhat deceptive, for the movement was hardly important enough to be called a revolution. It is really a study of the impact of the French Enlightenment and of the Revolution of 1789-95 on Spain, in matters cultural, ecclesiastical, and economic. Twice it appears that a revolution might have been in the making—in the reign of Charles III and in the late 1790's. Both times it collapsed. In the earlier period Charles not only abetted and encouraged, but led, the progressives in their efforts to install reforms of widespread character. His abstemious, scandal-free life rendered it impossible for the conservatives to attack him. His successor, Charles IV, tried half-heartedly to carry on, especially at church reform; but the French Revolution, with its attack on altar and throne, shocked the Spaniards, both conservative and liberal, and awakened in them nationalism and religious fervor. For a brief while in the late 1790's, with Jovellanos as secretary of grace and justice, it appeared that a sort of Spanish Gallican church might result, but the effort collapsed, due in part to the influence of Napoleon's invasion of Italy and the return of several hundred Jesuits to Spain.

The book has much of interest for the religious reader. Its author had access to many hitherto unused sources in Spain dealing with the Inquisition, and that institution is described at length. The Inquisitors and the Jesuits are depicted as the leaders of conservatism and Ultramontanism, although the Jesuits were expelled for most of this era. Even more space is given to the "Jansenists," the counterpart of the French Gallicans, who sought to increase the power of the

king and the bishops at Rome's expense. The author sympathizes with the liberals and reformers but is not anticlerical. He writes with fairness and fluency.

The book's chief value lies in its great abundance of detail, providing a clearer picture of what happened in Spain in the late 1700's, especially of Spanish reaction to the Revolution in France. A minor value lies in its presentation of Spanish nationalism arising in the 1790's, before the assumption of the Spanish throne by Joseph Bonaparte. The book's ending is somewhat anticlimactic, with the conservatives regaining complete power. Would it not have been better for Mr. Herr to have carried his study a few years farther, to the Spanish revolt against Joseph or indeed to the complete reestablishment of conservatism after the Congress of Vienna?

SHELBY T. McCLOY
University of Kentucky

Dean Church, The Anglican Response to Newman. By B. A. SMITH. London, New York, Toronto: Oxford University Press, 1958. xiv, 334 pp. \$4.80.

One of the dramatic moments in church history is the meeting of the Oxford University Convocation on St. Valentine's Eve, 1845, at which the suspensory veto of the Proctors prevented a formal academic censure of the ideas expounded by John Henry Newman in Tract XC five years before. The Senior Proctor, H. P. Guillemard, has left no further mark in history. His junior colleague, R. H. Church, remained in the center of English church life till his death in 1890. From Oxford he went to spend eighteen years in a country parish, where he was able to combine his pastoral labors with scholarly reviewing and religious journalism. Then in 1871 Gladstone called him to London as Dean of St. Paul's; if the structure of that Cathedral is Sir Christopher Wren's monument, its liturgical tradition is Dean Church's. Finally he returned to the battles of his youth in his posthumously published work on

The Oxford Movement — a minor classic of church history which is, I believe, responsible for establishing the usage of the term for the Tractarian movement of 1833-1845, and perhaps for a somewhat disproportionate attention given to events at Oxford in those years, by students of the Catholic revival in modern Anglicanism. What happened at Oxford in 1833-1845 was crucial for Church's life; not, as such, perhaps quite so decisive for the Church of England.

Modest as a man and humble as a Christian, Church occupied a central but not a conspicuous or dominating position in the English church history of his age. Solid lives have been written, but a modern re-survey is welcome, now that the Victorian age is being studied with renewed interest. B. A. Smith has been able to add to a new study of the published sources some additional material, especially Church's correspondence with Gladstone. Life-long friendship made Church an important advisor on church appointments in Gladstone's second administration, 1880-1885. Their conscientious correspondence is sometimes reminiscent of the frank ecclesiastical politics of an earlier age, as when Gladstone noted on the back of one of Church's recommendations, "How did he vote at Oxford in 1865 or at other times?" (p. 206).

Smith has produced a charming and accurate story of an attractive life (though I would note a slip on p. 166 where the episode of Newman's visit to St. Paul's is rather inaccurately reproduced from Ward's life). The reader naturally will reflect on the implications of the sub-title. Was Church's life and thought a response to Newman, and can it properly be called the Anglican response? One's first reaction is that Smith claims too much. Friend and admirer of the Cardinal as he always remained, Church would certainly have admitted that there were depths in Newman which he did not reach. Newman was almost a mystic and almost a skeptic; Church moved in calmer waters, his life marked, as Smith puts it, by "the generosity of view ap-

propriate to an ecclesiastic of literary interests" (p. 168). There is drama in the fact that so close a friend gave a positive answer to the question which Newman posed in 1837 and answered in the negative in 1845—is the *via media* of non-papal Catholicism a practicable program? Still every Anglo-Catholic priest or layman presents the same answer to that question. But Church's serenely confident faith, nurtured in a sense of history, and quickened by an awareness of changing needs, does mark him out as a distinctively Anglican religious leader, and in that sense justifies the phrase Smith applies to him.

E. R. HARDY

Berkeley Divinity School

The Diaries and Letters of Henry H. Spalding and Asa Bowen Smith relating to the Nez Perce Mission 1838-1842. Edited by CLIFFORD MERRILL DRURY. Glendale, Cal.: Arthur H. Clark Company, 1958. (Northwest Historical Series IV.) 379 pp. \$12.50.

The Mission to the Nez Perce Indians at Kamash, Idaho, under the Reverend Asa Bowen Smith is the last one of the four posts established by the American Board of Commissioners for Foreign Missions in the 1830's to be described by Dr. Drury. Previously he had done biographies of Dr. Marcus Whitman, who worked among the Cayuse Indians at Waiilatpu; the Rev. Henry H. Spalding, who labored among the Nez Perces at Lapwai; and the Rev. Elkanah Walker and his wife, Mary, who strove to convert the Spokane at Tshimakain. Now, by putting into print the bulk of the letters written by the Rev. Asa Bowen Smith he has made it possible for historians to get a better grasp of the entire operation which constituted the Oregon Mission of the American Board.

In describing the journey to Oregon Drury has drawn upon five diaries to enrich the story and give it fuller detail. It is thus a very rich description of one of the earliest trips by women overland to Oregon. In describing the Mission Drury lets the letters of Smith

and his wife speak for them, and because Smith was the most imaginative, best educated and most intelligent of the group the letters give a great deal of information about the Indians as well as the missionaries. Smith was also highly critical of the other missionaries, especially the Rev. Henry Harmon Spalding with whom he differed on the basic approach to the Indians. Spalding hoped to teach them farming, Smith ridiculed the idea, and criticized Spalding to the Rev. D. Greene, Secretary for the American Board.

The criticisms these intensely individualistic and sensitive men wrote back to Boston about each other as well as the fact that only a half dozen Indians were admitted to membership in the Church in the first four years, not to mention a suggestion of Smith that the whole work ought to be sold to the Methodists, caused the Board to order the closing of all posts but one. To prevent this disaster and to overcome the mischief their complaints had done, the missionaries, who had composed some of their differences, agreed to let Dr. Whitman ride east to Boston in 1842 and explain the situation. This he did and persuaded the Board to continue the work. Legends have grown up about this ride in the Pacific Northwest that have no basis in fact, and this volume ought to help in dispelling these erroneous tales that have at times done harm to another religious body.

By including the diary of Spalding and other information about him, Drury has given a picture of the conflict in ideas that existed between him and Smith, both missionaries to the same tribe. Drury has drawn upon his years of study of these missionaries to enhance the letters and diaries with explanations and notes that make the whole much more understandable to the reader. Unfortunately he fails to face up to the question as to why these missionaries failed to convert the Nez Perces to the Christian faith. It is my opinion that Drury magnifies the contribution made by Spalding when he gives this missionary much credit for

the revival that took place in 1872. But this is really outside the scope of the book.

This book is valuable because of the light it throws upon the life of the Indians of those days, and the impact of these early white settlers upon the Indians, as well as what it tells of the missionaries themselves. It points up the need for a volume covering the entire operation of the missionaries of the American Board. This work should show this relationship of their work to that of the other missionaries, especially that of the Roman Catholic priests, towards whom there was a bitter animosity. It should describe what part the missions played in the disintegration of the tribal life which exploded into warfare between the Indians and the whites. And lastly it should analyze the characters of these missionaries so as to explain why, in eleven years of effort after a most friendly reception, they should have won less than a dozen Indians to Christianity, and have so alienated these tribes that the Cayuses murdered Marcus Whitman and many Nez Perces sought to do the same to Spalding. Dr. Drury has laid the groundwork for such a book.

No one interested in the history of Christian Missions to Oregon can afford to overlook this work on Asa Bowen Smith and Henry Harmon Spalding.

THOMAS E. JESSETT
Seattle

The Great Basin Kingdom. By L. J. ARRINGTON. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1958. 534 pp. \$9.00.

It became a common practice after the turn of the century for "impartial" historians to side-step all religious controversy concerning the Mormons by focusing upon Saint communistic and cooperative economic enterprises. Richard T. Ely, Hamilton Gardner, Joseph Geddes and Edward Allen each took this route to objectivity between the years 1903 and 1936, while generally assuming if not asserting that the economic manipulations of the

Mormons were an outgrowth of their religious fervor. Two critics, Dean McBrien and Bernard DeVoto, charged in turn that Mormonism was at heart an economic movement with prayers and prophecy camouflaging a quest for profit. The Utahn, Leonard Arrington, has reaffirmed the former view, uniquely combining a scrutinization of Mormon economic institutions with an enlightening account of the religious philosophy which underlay their economic experiments.

Arrington's over-all interpretation is that the Mormons through the medium of their "kingdom" sought to reverse the accelerating tendency to separate religion and life in America by giving "equal attention to the spiritual and temporal needs of man." Arrington quotes Brigham Young to the effect that the Saints would "not be satisfied with anything short of being governed and controlled by the word of the Lord in all our acts. . . . If we do not live for this, we do not live to be one with Christ" (p. 5). By 1900, Arrington observes, the Mormons were forced to give up their felicitous quest for religious inclusiveness and Gentile exclusion but they did establish an economy sufficient to support half a million people and to export goods and services to many of the adjoining western states.

Arrington's story has four main divisions. Joseph Smith's "Design for the Kingdom" (1830-46) was conceived in New York's Burnt District but matured in Far West and Nauvoo. The "Building of the Kingdom" (1847-68) occurred under the direction of Brigham Young and was largely accomplished before the railroad arrived. Its appearance saw "The Kingdom Threatened" (1869-84) with a loss of theocratic control, economic autonomy, and religious orientation, but a church program of industrial and mercantile development reinforced group loyalty and institutions. Only the sledge hammer blow of the Edmunds-Tucker Act brought the "Kingdom in Retreat" (1885-1900) and the acceptance by the Mormons of a secular economy. Within this broad context Arrington

constructs a sweeping mosaic of the Mormon efforts to sustain life and then to develop their intermontane region through a program of controlled land distribution, public works projects, an overland freight company, various manufacturing endeavors, agricultural supervision, railroad building and the like. While surveying these activities he pauses to suggest an economic motive for the sending of troops to Utah in 1857 (pp. 171-74), the Godbeite opposition to Young's policies when the railroad appeared (p. 243), and the "raid" by Federal officers, ostensibly to stamp out polygamy (pp. 349, 352).

While the book is replete with broad generalizations, arresting interpretive insights, and discriminate detail, one segment seems at once both tantalizingly suggestive and somewhat inadequate. This is the first chapter where the "Early Economic Experiences of the Latter-day Saints" are described. Most historians have found Smith's administrative policies lacking in practicality, but Arrington argues briefly that in Far West and Nauvoo the Mormons under Smith were routed toward a balanced, self-sustaining economy and that much of what Brigham Young accomplished in Utah was the product of Smith's planning. This viewpoint should be substantiated more fully.

But Arrington's analysis seems deficient when he tries to account for the Mormon preoccupation with economic pursuits. His argument that an unusual degree of religiousness was responsible (pp. 5, 34, 432, n. 113) is elsewhere contradicted by the allegation that the whole project "was part and parcel of the Puritan democratic theory concretely expressed in the Commonwealth of Massachusetts" (pp. 35, 62). Here, it would seem, the Mormons were mimicking the very sort of economic administration practiced by New England's secular-minded Gentiles. There is a degree of truth in this, but Arrington might have better achieved his purpose had he searched for the religious impulses which made a Christ-like economy seem desirable. As of now one can only

speculate that the mammoth campaign of the "Theocrats" to promote a thoroughly Christian America may have had some influence in shaping the ultraistic mind of the Mormons.

MARVIN S. HILL

Chicago

American Protestantism and Social Issues 1919-1939. By ROBERT MOATS MILLER. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1958. xiv, 385 pp. \$6.00.

This is a painstaking and comprehensive survey of the attitudes and actions of churches, denominational bodies and commissions, and individuals regarding the broad range of social concerns of this twenty-year period. It is a virtual source book and in a sense may be described as an attempt to follow the fortunes of the social gospel in the twenties and thirties. Actually a much wider range of issues than are traditionally associated with that movement are reviewed, demonstrating the broadening interests of American churchmen, probably because of it.

The author considers his findings on civil liberties the most important of his inquiry. Here he deals with the attitudes of the churches toward lynching, the Ku Klux Klan, the teaching of evolution, loyalty oaths, the Sacco and Vanzetti, Mooney, and Scottsboro cases, and the Red scares. The record of the churches here "is not perfect"; certain of them made "an extremely poor showing," but on the whole "the record of the Protestant churches is a proud one"; in many of these situations they played a role "somewhat more gallant than is generally believed." Professor Miller's "footnote" to the election of 1928 is significant: he holds that the Klan played only a small part, that clergymen hardly "forced" their congregations to vote against Smith, that prohibition "was not a straw man," and that the religious argument was carried on for the most part on a level well above that of bigotry.

Six chapters are given to the relations of the churches to the labor movement, with the conclusion that American Protestantism "did not betray labor." On the contrary, labor often used the church for its own ends but rarely supported it. The prevailing attitude was expressed by William Green: what can the church do for labor?—a sad conclusion after a half-century of pro-labor agitation on the part of churchmen, for it had been the labor problem more than any other issue that evoked the social gospel in the first place.

Other solid chapters deal with liberalism, socialism, race relations, and the attitudes of the churches toward war and peace, the League of Nations, the World Court, the Pact of Paris. The author concludes that although neo-orthodoxy changed the basis of Christian criticism of the social order in the 1930's, it would be difficult to distinguish between traditional social gospel spokesmen and neo-orthodox adherents in actual practice. Nor does he think the older social gospel advocates were quite as naive as their critics have claimed. The two decades he describes witnessed the continued activism of American Protestantism. The southern churches were less liberal and spoke less frequently on social issues, yet Miller believes they were more realistic in their approach to war, their evaluation of socialism, and their awareness of "the demonic element in man," and there was always a prophetic minority among them. On the whole, the historian finds much in the social attitudes of the Protestant churches of America between 1919 and 1939 that is "hopeful and charitable." The reviewer can say more of this book: marred by a few errors and at times a garrulous or gossipy style, it chronicles well the efforts of Protestant churchmen to bring Christian ethics to bear upon the basic controversial issues with which American society was concerned in these two eventful decades.

C. HOWARD HOPKINS

*Westminster Choir College,
Princeton, N. J.*

INSTITUTE

Chicago
PRESS

THEOLOGY

THE AUTOBIOGRAPHY OF EDWARD SCRIBNER AMES

Edited by Van Meter Ames

As a philosopher, Edward Scribner Ames was a pragmatist, during his membership in the "Chicago School" of philosophy, along with such men as John Dewey, George Herbert Mead, James M. Tufts, and C. I. Lewis. As a theologian, he was a liberal, countering the separation during the famous Disputation at the University Church of Disciples of Christ as that denominational name was then known, since Alexander Campbell. Both his remarkable character and his enormous ability to influence for the better those with whom he came into contact are reflected in his autobiography—about which Rev. Harold W. Fox, editor of the *Christian Century*, says: "I believe that most readers will say that book, however revealing it may be, is what they have met what is finite could be called 'Great Books'."

\$5.00

THE HISTORY OF RELIGIONS

Edited by Max Müller, translated by Joseph M. Kilkenny

These essays in methodology—theology of the late Joachim Wach—have been written by Wilfred Cantwell Smith, Alfred Torday, René Daniélou, Louis Massignon, Ernst Benz, Friedrich Hader, and the editors. Each writer deals in his separate way with methodological questions, and with the limitations of systematic knowledge. The individual papers sometimes complement, sometimes challenge each other, but each offers a sense of knowledge and intriguing them to the alert, intelligent reader.

\$5.00

HENRY VAUGHAN

EXPERIENCE AND THE TRADITION

By John Carter

"Rev. Carter's *Henry Vaughan* is an informed, thoughtful, and provocative book. Whatever particular quibbles a reader may have, the study as a whole is, first, a vigorous and acute corrective to the conventional Romantic approach of nearly all modern criticism; and, secondly, a positive interpretation, in an individual and elusive but thoroughly Christian key. The book is both broadly based and minutely exegetical, and it has value for any student of seventeenth-century religious poetry and thought."—Douglas Bush.

\$4.00

THROUGHOUT AMERICA
UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO PRESS

Chicago Press 720 South Michigan Avenue, Chicago 5, Illinois

Montreal: The University of Toronto Press, Toronto 2, Ontario

London: Oxford University Press, London, W.C.1

Auckland: Oxford University Press, Auckland, N.Z.

STADT AM CHURCH

Dr.
Row of
the
best

"...as a whole." —



